

BL

AUG 7 1950

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Q Sapientia fortiter gubernat
qui disponens omnia: veni ad
doctrinam non tam prudenter



PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

VOLUME XXXII

JULY 1950

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

The Meaning of Power for St. Paul.....	<i>A. Haire Forster</i>	177
The Anointing at Bethany and Jesus' Burial	<i>David Daube</i>	186
The Prophet Isaiah	<i>W. Norman Pittenger</i>	199
The Idea of Freedom in the Teaching of the Apostle Paul	<i>Hans Wedell</i>	204
Book Reviews		217
Notes on New Books		239

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

UNIVERSITY PRESS
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE

\$1.00 A NUMBER

\$3.50 A YEAR

Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXXII

JULY 1950

NUMBER 3

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., D.S.Litt., D.C.L., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City
BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. HOLT HUTTON GRAHAM, M.A., Instructor in New Testament, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary
SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

-:-

EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D.
RT. REV. STEPHEN F. BAYNE, JR., S.T.D.
PROF. FRANK W. BUCKLER, S.T.D.
PRES. GORDON KEITH CHALMERS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D.
RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D.
RT. REV. RICHARD S. M. EMRICH, Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES R. FEILDING, M.A.
REV. THEODORE P. FERRIS, D.D.
REV. JOSEPH F. FLETCHER, S.T.D.
REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D.
REV. H. E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D.
REV. ROBERT MCQUEEN GRANT, Th.D.
RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D.
PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D.
REV. EDWARD R. HARDY, JR., Ph.D.
REV. LOUIS A. HASELMAYER, JR., Ph.D.
REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D.
REV. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, Ph.D.
REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D.
REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR., Ph.D.
PROF. JOHN S. MARSHALL, Ph.D.
REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D.

REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D.
REV. ARNOLD S. NASH, D.D.
RT. REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D.
REV. WILLIAM H. NES, D.D., D.C.L.
REV. PIERSON PARKER, Th.D.
REV. W. NORMAN PITTINGER, S.T.D.
REV. CYRIL C. RICHARDSON, Th.D.
REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D.
REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D.
REV. OSCAR J. F. SEITZ, Th.D.
REV. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., Ph.D.
RT. REV. HENRY KNOX SHERRILL, D.D.
REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D.
REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D.
RT. REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D.
RT. REV. ROBERT E. L. STRIDER, D.D.
REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, JR., Th.D.
PROF. GEORGE F. THOMAS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, D.D.
RT. REV. H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, D.D.
REV. PERCY L. URBAN, S.T.D.
PROF. JOACHIM WACH, Ph.D.
REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D.
REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D.
REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D.

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut
THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC, Berkeley, California
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City
KENYON COLLEGE, Gambier, Ohio

NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin
TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut
TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, Sewanee, Tennessee
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia
SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

-:-

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: January, April, July, October. Subscription price \$3.50 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. Holt H. Graham, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Sewanee, Tennessee.

3
0-
W
0,

0

in
it
e,
L
a,
-
y,
-
0
L
n,
e



Anglican Theological Review

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT

VOLUME XXXII

JULY 1950

NUMBER 3

THE MEANING OF POWER FOR ST. PAUL

By A. HAIRE FORSTER

Evanston, Illinois

A paper read to the Chicago Society of Biblical Research.

Sir Wm. Ramsay once wrote, "The word Power was technical in the language of religion, superstition, and magic, and was one of the most common and characteristic terms in the language of Pagan devotion."¹ It is still a common and characteristic word, but not in the language of devotion, whether Christian or otherwise.

The story has appeared in different contexts but seems to be essentially true that when it was suggested that the Pope should have a share in the post-war settlement, Stalin asked, "The Pope, how many divisions has he?" That is a modern up-to-date meaning of Power. The Great Powers are the nations with the most divisions, the strongest fleets, the deadliest bombs. The Danes were once a Great Power: their fleets were a terror to England, their savage soldiers pillaged and burned the artistic treasures of Ireland. Now they are a peaceful, intelligent, and civilized people, and Denmark as a Power is just nothing at all. *The Coming Struggle for Power* is the title of a book by John Strachey (published in 1923). The struggle is between Capitalism and Communism, and here the power discussed is economic. In Adler's book, *Understanding Human Nature*, he

¹*The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament.*
4th ed., London, 1920, p. 118.

wrote (p. 57), "In childhood fantasies, striving for power plays the predominant role." It seems to extend beyond childhood fantasies, and Adler himself wrote later on (p. 73), "Striving for Power, the most prominent evil of our civilization." What then is Power? This is not an academic question, it is perhaps the fundamental question of the present day.

Power (Greek *dunamis*, from which our word "dynamic" is derived) is a favorite word of St. Paul; he uses it more than forty times. At least one other writer was more fond of the word than St. Paul, George Fox, the Quaker. It may sometimes be found four or five times on a single page of his *Journal*, and for him power's function is to produce peace and quiet. "The Lord's power came over all and kept all quiet" (p. 160); again, "Our meeting ended in the Lord's power, quiet and peaceable" (p. 163). That was what power meant for George Fox. What did it mean for St. Paul? St. Paul, it is generally agreed, was a remarkable man: his enemies—and he still has some—thought that he was worth murdering; his equals seem to have found him difficult to get on with; his junior assistants seem to have been devoted to him; and today it may be said that, whether for better or for worse, no one has influenced Christian Theology as much as this man. He was a Roman citizen; and, if it is still permitted to use the Book of Acts in discussing St. Paul, he was proud of his Roman citizenship. He knew what military, political, and economic power meant; at one time he thought that power meant force—"Saul yet breathing out murderous threats against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts 9:1).

There are two foci around which St. Paul's thinking about power revolve: one was his conviction that Jesus was risen, the other his own personal experiences as a missionary. If he was mistaken as to the resurrection, and if he misinterpreted his own experiences, then our interest in St. Paul can only be a psychological interest in a man of great capabilities who chose a life of danger and hardship because of a mistake and a delusion. Be this as it may, the resurrection of Jesus and his own experiences make the *meaning of power* for St. Paul.

In recent years the meaning has been much debated; like most problems, it also occupied the attention of the ancient Greeks. Indeed a philosopher of the Greek Skeptical School was so impressed by the difficulty of conveying meaning by words that, with rare con-

sistency, he gave up ever saying anything and passed his later years in eloquent silence.

In their book, *The Meaning of Meaning*, published in 1923, Ogden and Richards wrote: "Words were never a more common means than they are today of concealing ignorance and persuading even ourselves that we possess opinions when we are merely vibrating with verbal reverberations." Bacon, we remember, said that the idols of the forum, that is idols imposed on the understanding by words, are the most troublesome of all idols.

The problem of meaning is a problem of communication by signs, that is usually by words. What does the sign refer to in the mind of the speaker or writer? It is not always easy to say. Consider the sign, *Hē oikonomia tou mustēriou*, in Ephesians 3:9. Some scribes did not think it had any meaning, and substituted *koinōnia* for *oikonomia*. What was going on in the writer's mind when he penned or dictated the phrase? Translators are not agreed. "Dispensation," "stewardship," "new order" are some of the signs by which they symbolize their interpretations. The author's purpose, philosophy of religion, date, education, environment—all these things are involved in his use of the phrase. Incidentally, Wade's paraphrase makes good sense: "The Divine method of carrying out that secret purpose."

Meaning is an elusive and elastic thing. The date of writing is often very important. There was a time when it was high praise to say that so-and-so was a painful preacher, meaning that he took great pains in preparing his sermons; now the adjective would mean that the pains were in the congregation. An alderman of the seventeenth century is said to have died of thought. This seems to be most unlikely. The explanation of course is that "thought" meant "anxiety" three hundred years ago. Hence we read in the King James version, "Take no thought for the morrow." That the meaning of a word varies in different contexts even in a single author is familiar to everyone, but it is necessary to widen greatly the conception of context before we can arrive at or even near the true meaning of a word. The context is not only the paragraph in which the word occurs, it is the life-situation of the author and his readers, their culture, their geographical, social and economic condition; the meaning of a word in fact is never absolute, words are merely symbols and there is such a thing as symbolic relativity.

Now the Greek word *dunamis* has more than a dozen different meanings; the English word *power* is equally prolific. *Dunamis* can mean in mathematics a square; it can mean a medicine; it can even mean "meaning" and is so used once by St. Paul: "If I do not know the *dunamis* (meaning) of the sound, I will be to the one speaking a barbarian" (I Cor. 14:11). This is a good classical meaning for *dunamis*; it is so used by Plato and the orator Lysias, but of course for St. Paul it is only an exceptional meaning. A man, it is said, is known by the company he keeps, and this is also true of words. *Dunamis* for St. Paul is a theological word and is linked with *doxa* (glory) as it is in the liturgical appendix to the Lord's Prayer, "For thine is the Kingdom and the Power and the Glory for ever and ever" (Matt. 6:13). The connection of power and glory is also made in the Apocalypse (4:11 and 19:1). In Romans 6:4 Christ was raised through the *glory* of the Father; in I Cor. 6:14 it is through the *power*.

Doxa (glory) is the usual translation of the Hebrew *Kabhad* and this Hebrew word has the root meaning of weight: the glory of a person or thing is what gives him or her or it weight, importance; the glory of Lebanon is its trees, of Assyria its armies. Thus we can see why *dunamis* and *doxa* are often almost identified. The Hebrew word *ôz*, in English usually translated "might," is translated four times in successive verses of Psalm 67, three times as *dunamis*, once as *doxa*.

Another word in close alliance with *dunamis* is *pneuma* (spirit), as in I Thess. 1:5, "The Gospel did not reach you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit," and again in I Cor. 2:4, "Now my message and my proclamation was not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in display of spirit and of power." This association of spirit and of power is important for the understanding, not of what power is, but of what it does—according to St. Paul. "What is electricity?" is a question to which there is, so far as I know, no complete answer, yet we know what electricity does under certain fixed conditions and through fixed appliances: it can turn darkness to light, cold to heat, silence to sound, stillness to motion, it can also change life to death. "What is power?" is a question somewhat similar to "What is electricity?" but a much wider one, for electricity is one kind of power. Now St. Paul is quite definite as to what the Spirit does. "The fruit of the Spirit is [among other things] peace,

long suffering, joy. . . ." If Spirit and power are allied and therefore alike in function, these are rather unusual results of power according to modern ideas. In another of those passages which connect power with glory there is the same surprise (Col. 1:11), "Empowered with all power according to the might of his glory to all endurance and long suffering."

Power has been described—not defined—as, "The possibility of effecting or experiencing change when the possibility is regarded as inherent in the agent or thing which is to act or be acted on."⁴ Its effects sometimes depend on the thing acted on. Heat for instance melts some things, hardens others. This description divides power into two kinds, personal and impersonal, and that marks to a large extent the difference between the meaning of power for St. Paul and for the Greek world of his time. In the *Festgabe für Deissmann*, Tübingen, 1927, there is an essay by Otto Schmitz, "Der Begriff Dunamis bei Paulus." As a German scholar of his period, his investigation is mainly in the field of *Religionsgeschichte*: What light do the popular ideas of the first century throw on St. Paul's use of the word? His conclusion is that these popular ideas occasionally appear in St. Luke's use of the word *dunamis*, but not in St. Paul's. The general conception of *dunamis* at the time, Schmitz decided, was similar to the Polynesian conception of *Mana*, a mysterious all-pervading force which can be set in motion by those in the secret through ritual and ceremonial acts, and can be used for ends either beneficent or malignant.

Power in fact was magic power, and the New Testament itself bears witness to the importance of magicians in the first century. In Acts 13:6ff, the Governor of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus, whom St. Luke describes as an intelligent man, is found with a magician as a kind of court chaplain. St. Paul according to the story had his *mana* too and strikes Barjesus (or Elymas or whatever his name was) blind. At Ephesus, those who owned magical books, presumably incantation formulae, burn them in response to St. Paul's message, in spite of the fact that they cost a lot of money (Acts 19:9). Sorcery, which Fraser calls positive magic as opposed to taboo or negative magic, is placed by St. Paul after idolatry among the works of the flesh (Gal. 5:20), and in Apoc. 22:15, outside the celestial city are dogs and *sorcerers*.

⁴Baldwin, *Dict. of Philosophy and Psychology*, Macmillan, 1902, Vol. II, p. 318.

In the first century belief in the existence of the ancient gods and of some new ones was common enough no doubt, but their power was becoming less and less evident. They were losing prestige, and that is the situation in which magic flourishes: the magician could manipulate, could even threaten the gods themselves. The situation may be illustrated by a story which Fraser tells of what happened in Sicily in 1893 A.D. There was a six months drought. Processions with litanies to the saints were tried, men and women and children lay all night before the holy images telling their beads, but still no rain. Then the peasants lost patience; they dumped St. Joseph in a garden to see the state of things for himself and swore to leave him there in the sun until rain fell; other saints were turned like naughty children with their faces to the wall; others were ducked in horse ponds. The saints like the old gods had apparently lost their power. But St. Paul's idea of power was of a different order. It is quite wonderful how easily some scholars can label any idea which they find in the first century! This we are told is Hellenistic, this is Hellenistic Judaism, this is normative Judaism, this is Orientalism. In an age whose main characteristic was syncretism, in an age when there was much traveling to and fro, these distinctions may surely be overdone. Some scholars moreover do not seem to contemplate the possibility of a man having an idea of his own. Some clear distinctions, however, can be discerned: the idea of power for St. Paul the Jew was something quite different from that of Posidonius the eclectic philosopher.

In the article on *dunamis* in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Grundmann sums up the Hellenistic idea of Power in these words (p. 291): "Behind the whole Greek power-idea as we have now unfolded it, stands the idea of a power of nature ruling in the Cosmos, moving and determining it in various ways, and these grow out of the widespread existing *mana* and *orenda* ideas." Immediately following this summary, he begins the section on the idea of power in the Old Testament with these words: "When we come from the world of Hellenism into that of the Old Testament, quite a different breeze blows on us. Instead of the neutral idea of God stands the personal God. Instead of the neutral powers of nature stand the power and might of the personal God—this difference which has its root in the idea of God comes to clear expression in the idea of power." There are of course magical ideas of power in

the Old Testament; the Israelites did not live in a vacuum; but Power in the Old Testament is the power exercised by the Living God in order to carry out his purpose and will in history, and as to the powers of nature, God is the Creator and therefore *over* nature. A prayer of Moses in Deut. 3:24 expresses this in brief, "O Lord God, thou hast begun to show thy servant thy greatness and thy mighty hand: for what God is there in heaven or in earth that can do according to thy works and according to thy power?"

This was the idea of power in which St. Paul was brought up. He calls himself a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5). Power was the power of the Living God displayed in the history of his people, and for him this power culminated but did not end in the resurrection of Christ; henceforth it is Christ's power working in the lives of his converts: "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:24). In the Old Testament, God's power was shown most clearly in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the journey through the wilderness; it was also shown in acts of discipline and of punishment, for the purpose of God was the formation and training of a community, the changing of a group of ex-slaves into a Kingdom of priests, a holy nation (Exod. 19:5, 6).

Power, as previously noted, may be described as the possibility of effecting a change. Now St. Paul's goal was also a community, and to reach this vast changes were necessary. He was working for a community whose members might deserve the name of the *hagioi* (translated "saints"), those separated from surrounding evil, the name of the *brethren*, those who could live in harmony and mutual aid, a Community which might without mockery be called the Body of Christ, the Temple of God. With such material to work with and with such a goal, it is not surprising that he was interested in power, power to change.

It is significant that more than half of the occurrences of the word *dunamis* in St. Paul are in the two Corinthian letters—or four, if you like. Corinth must have seemed one of the least likely places in the world in which to establish a colony of God. Furthermore St. Paul's first arrival in Corinth was, he says, "in weakness and in fear and in much trembling" (I Cor. 2:3). He begins II Corinthians by telling them of the distress he had been through in Asia, how he felt the crushing weight of it to be "far beyond our capacity to sustain, so that we despaired even of life." Then the community at

Corinth had turned out to be his "problem child." They were conceited, quarrelsome, morally lax, party-men not churchmen, their gatherings for worship were a disgrace, some of them had insulted him publicly and the community had made no protest. Such a community was in need of knowing the power of God and that this power could be exhibited in punishment.

Of a member who had violated the laws of decency and so endangered the health and reputation of the *koinônia* (fellowship) St. Paul wrote, "Take measures to have him who has done this deed removed from among you. I for my part, though in body absent from you yet in spirit present with you, have already as though actually on the spot decided in the capacity of representative of our Lord Jesus Christ (you and my own spirit meeting for co-operation together with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ), to deliver over such an offender to Satan for the destruction of his flesh that his spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 5:2-5). Note here that Satan has not power over the community; it is beyond his sphere of influence, and the offender must be formally handed over to him; moreover this handing over is apparently not final; but it is a *condemning* power used for the protection of the community. Power for St. Paul has therefore above all a social purpose; it is for the edification, the building up of the community. St. Paul's letters contain many short ethical precepts: "In diligence not slothful," "Patient in tribulation," "Given to hospitality," and so on. But St. Paul is not a mere precept-monger; all these precepts are in the interest of *koinônia*, "fellowship," "sharing," or however we may translate the word. *Koinônia* is the basis of his ethics; his aim is a healthy community, and for this in his opinion Divine power is required, power which will overcome the pride and selfishness of man.

One more feature in the meaning of power for St. Paul must be mentioned: the power of weakness, of self-emptying so that the power of God may fill the vacuum. The counterpart to the power of weakness would be the weakness of strength, and this is well illustrated in Fairy stories: the giants always lose in the end. In one of the Norse myths, the gods cannot bind the wolf-monster Fenris with the strongest chains, yet he is finally bound by a silk-like chain made by the dwarfs, made out of, amongst other things, the sound of a cat's footfall and the breath of a fish. This myth has a modern parallel. Between the wars a German statesman said to a member of the

British Embassy, "Our Reich is bound together by chains of steel, your Empire is held together by moonbeams." "Yes," replied the Englishman, "but you can cut chains of steel. How do you cut moonbeams?" These tales do not exactly fit the present subject, yet they do remind us that the most obvious power is not necessarily the strongest power. Effective power is often hidden, and so for St. Paul the power of God is concealed because it operates through men who are hampered by the weakness of the flesh. But this very weakness of the flesh, in St. Paul's view, is the assurance that when the power is manifested, it is the power of God. "We have this treasure," he writes, "in earthen vessels, that the transcendence of the power may be of God and not from us" (II Cor. 4:7). And again, "Most gladly then will I boast in weaknesses, that the power of Christ may rest upon me—for when I am weak, then am I strong" (II Cor. 12:9f).

To sum up briefly, the question, "What is power?" has not been answered. Power for St. Paul is Power from on High, which in his experience is made perfect in weakness. Its purpose is the building up of communities and eventually of a world-wide community, and therefore it works to produce those qualities which make for *koinônia*, patience, long-suffering, peace, *agâpê*, and to destroy those traits which destroy *koinônia*. It works through mortals who have shown all too clearly that of themselves and in themselves they cannot live as members one of another; to do that they need a spirit and a power from outside which can kill selfishness—personal, national, religious—in all its manifold forms.

THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY AND JESUS' BURIAL

By DAVID DAUBE

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

The following remarks¹ are intended to show that the different versions of the narrative of the anointing at Bethany reflect so many different explanations of the treatment of Jesus' body at the time of his burial.

I. MARK AND JOHN: THE MAIN DISTINCTION

The fundamental difference between Mark and John is that in Mark the woman anticipates, i.e. here and now performs, the burial rite of anointing,² whereas in John she does not.³ More precisely, in Mark, Jesus says of her that προέλαβεν μυρίσαι τὸ σῶμά μου εἰςτὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. The import of this ought not to be watered down: her act is boldly declared a valid, though proleptic, anointing of the body for burial. Jurists would call the statement a legal fiction, an authoritative interpretation of facts as something which, but for that interpretation, they would not be. On the basis of the interpretation in Mark, the burial rite of anointing has now taken place. In contradistinction, in John, if we accept—as we must⁴—the reading ἀρεσ αὐτὴν ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό, no such fiction is established. However we translate the sentence—and there are various possibilities—one thing is clear: it does not assert that the burial rite of anointing has been performed. On the contrary, the burial—‘the day of my burial’—is thought of, quite naturally, as entirely belonging to the future.

To understand this difference, it is necessary to consider the actual treatment of Jesus' body after his death. According to Mark, who has the burial rite at Bethany by way of anticipation, Joseph of Arimathaea did not anoint the body,⁵ and the women who intended to

¹A communication read in Professor C. H. Dodd's Seminar on the New Testament at Cambridge.

²Mark 14:8.

³John 12:7.

⁴The Koine reading τετήρηκεν is evidently an assimilation to Mark and Matthew.

⁵Mark 15:42ff.

do so came too late.⁶ According to John, who has no burial rite by way of anticipation at Bethany, Joseph and Nicodemus anointed the body with a hundred pounds of spices.⁷ The position cannot be the result of a series of coincidences. Both Mark and John take care to point out that the burial rite of anointing was performed. For Mark, it was performed at Bethany—by virtue of a fiction—and nothing was done after Jesus' death. For John, Jesus' body was actually anointed after his death, and the action at Bethany is not represented as performance of the burial rite.

Very probably, the earliest tradition was that Jesus had been buried in a plain linen cloth, unanointed, like a common criminal.⁸ This tradition was unbearable to the believers. Moreover, it may well have been seized upon by their Jewish opponents as an additional sign of disgrace, a manifest confirmation of the 'scandal' of the crucifixion. It has recently been argued that it was not the suffering of Jesus as such, but the abject form that it took, which constituted the 'scandal'.⁹ The omission of the rite of anointing would be an integral part of the charge. Mark gives one reply: Jesus' body was anointed in advance. John gives another: his body was anointed by Joseph and Nicodemus.

II. MARK AND JOHN: CONTINUATION

Four details may be noted here.

(1) In Mark's version of the anointing at Bethany, since a burial rite here and now is contemplated, the box is broken and the entire

⁶Mark 16:1ff.

⁷John 19:39f. The spices, it seems, are to be thought of, not as absolutely dry, but as in a resinous, greasy state. Mark 16:1, which tells of the plan of some women to apply spices to the body of Jesus after his death, uses the verb *ἀλείφω*. See also H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. 1, pp. 427f., vol. 2, pp. 48f.: myrrh was widely used in the form of ointment to heal and beautify.

⁸For the burial of persons executed, see Mishnah Sanhedrin 6:5f. and Josephus, Ant. 4.202 (*ἀτίμως καὶ ἀφανῶς*), 264 (*νυκτός*), 5.44 (*ἐν νυκτὶ ταφὴ ἄτμος*); cp. A. Büchler, *Revue des Etudes Juives*, vol. 46, pp. 75, 88. For the luxury normally connected with funerals in New Testament times, see Babylonian Kethuboth 8b; it was Gamaliel II, about 90 A.D., who, in order to relieve poor people of the intolerable burden up to then involved in a funeral, had himself buried in a plain linen cloth.

⁹See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 283f. He quotes from Se-mahoth 8 an utterance by Ishmael, about 130 A.D., when facing martyrdom: 'Do I weep because we are to be slain? No, but because we are to be slain in the same way as murderers and as desecrators of the Sabbath were'.

ointment poured over Jesus' head.¹⁰ No doubt we are meant to infer that the ointment covered him; this is borne out by his own words, *μνοίσαι τὸ σῶμά μου*.¹¹ At any rate, it is not the way in which one would normally anoint a guest or teacher. In John, as no present burial rite is contemplated, the box is not broken, and it is Jesus' feet that are anointed, presumably with the hand.¹² No mention of an anointing of the body occurs in Jesus' words *ἀφες αὐτὴν ἵνα . . .*.¹³

(2) In Mark, the argument is as follows.¹⁴ Some contend that the value of the ointment ought to have been spent on almsgiving. Jesus' reply is in three parts, forming an ascending line. (a) The woman has done 'a good work.' The point can be appreciated only if we bear in mind the technical Rabbinic sense of 'good work': almsgiving, putting up strangers, visiting the sick, burying the dead, or the like.¹⁵ Jesus begins by mysteriously affirming that her action is a 'good work' just as much as almsgiving. Exactly what kind of 'good work' he means he does not yet specify. (b) He adds that 'ye have the poor always . . . but me ye have not always.' This is reminiscent of the Rabbinic doctrine that almsgiving is less praiseworthy than the other 'good works', one reason being that the former can be done only for the living while the latter extend also to the dead.¹⁶ So here he commences to specify the 'good work' he has in mind: it is superior to almsgiving, superior because done to one (and that one Jesus) whom 'ye have not always'. (c) There follows the culmination, the revelation to which (a) and (b) have been leading up: she has performed the burial rite of anointing. On the other hand, in John,¹⁷ part (a) is completely missing. The woman's action is not called 'a good work': it could not be—the anointing does not constitute a burial rite. The reply begins with *ἀφες αὐτὴν ἵνα εἰς τὴν θύραν . . .*, corresponding to part (c) in Mark, but, as pointed out above, quite unlike it in substance. There is no assertion of a pres-

¹⁰Mark 14:3.

¹¹Mark 14:8.

¹²John 12:3. The superstition that grew up amongst Jews against anointing, not with the hand, but direct from a flask—see H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 427—may have had its root in the association of this method with funerals.

¹³John 12:7.

¹⁴Mark 14:4ff.

¹⁵For numerous references, see H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, pt. I, pp. 536ff. and 559ff.

¹⁶Tosephata Peah 4:19, Babylonian Sukkah 49b.

¹⁷John 12:4ff.

ent burial rite, but a reference to the future day of burial. The clause 'for the poor always ye have with you . . .', (b) in Mark, comes last in John. As no burial rite here and now is in question, it would not do to let this reflection on Jesus' death precede the reference to the future day of burial. If the impression of abruptness is to be avoided, it must be introduced as an afterthought to, a fuller explanation of, that reference.

(3) In Mark, the incident takes place after the entry into Jerusalem and very near Passover—as near the actual burial as possible. In John, it takes place before the entry and not quite so near.

(4) John emphasizes that Joseph and Nicodemus dealt with the body 'as the manner of the Jews is to bury.'¹⁸ This remark does sound as if it were directed against disparaging talk on the part of the Jews. John flatly denies any basis in fact for their charge. There is no mere re-interpreting of some other action as standing for the rite; the rite was really performed in the correct, indeed, in a particularly splendid, fashion. The presence of Nicodemus, which at first sight looks somewhat unmotivated, may well be mentioned as guaranteeing the proper observance of the ritual: he was a respected Pharisee.¹⁹

As for dependence, it is obvious even at this stage that Mark was ignorant of an actual anointing after death. Otherwise he would not have dropped it in favour of anointing by anticipation: a fiction, however good a substitute for fact, is still a substitute. Unbelievers would not readily accept it, and even a believer, if not trained in such matters, might feel uneasy. Neither, however, is it likely that John used Mark. There would have been no reason for replacing

¹⁸John 19:40.

¹⁹John 3:1. There is one feature which may conceivably be an indication that even John's story of the anointing after death is an extension of, ultimately derives from, the anointing at Bethany. The body, we are told, was anointed with spices, with myrrh and aloes (John 19:39f). But in Rabbinic sources, these occur only where anointing takes place *inter vivos*, not where the dead are anointed. For the latter purpose, oil is invariably used. So it may be arguable that myrrh and aloes are out of place in a Jewish burial, and that their presence in John must be due to this anointing after death going back to some anointing of Jesus while he lived. However, it is hardly credible that John should be guilty of a mistake of this kind. The more probable solution, therefore, is that though the Rabbis never mention (possibly suppress?) the custom, the Jews did employ spices for anointing the dead. H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 53, are satisfied that the New Testament passages about Joseph and Nicodemus, and about the women planning to anoint the dead body, furnish adequate proof of the custom; and S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, vol. 2, p. 55, concurs.

the anointing of the head²⁰ by an anointing of the feet.²¹ Certainly, John did not need an anointing of the head—and body—since, in his eyes, the woman was not there and then performing the burial rite. But it is difficult to think of any objection he might have had against this mode of anointing had he been following Mark. Another change would be even more inexplicable: in John, the woman wipes the anointed feet with her hair.²² If John was following Mark, why should he have inserted this impossible detail?

A conjecture as to the growth of the narrative will be submitted at the end.

III. ἵνα τηρήσῃ αὐτό²³

So far, we have not gone into the precise meaning of this phrase; and it may be stressed that the main thesis advanced is unaffected by the question. Nevertheless it may be worth while to draw attention to a few points.

(1) The usual and most natural translation is: 'that she may keep it'—*scil.* the ointment. In John, it may be recalled, there is no breaking of the box and pouring out of the entire ointment, as at burial, but the woman anoints Jesus' feet. So some ointment may be left.

But what is the purpose of keeping it? It is to be kept 'against the day of my burial'. It is tempting to see here a trace of the tradition represented in Mark²⁴ and Luke,²⁵ though not in John (nor in Matthew), that after Jesus' death several women planned to anoint the dead body. The identification of the woman of Bethany with Mary²⁶—not to be found in the synoptics—may point in the same direction: according to Mark²⁷ and Luke,²⁸ Mary was among the women that hoped to anoint the dead body. If this is so, the phrase under discussion means that she ought to keep the ointment for that subsequent occasion. As John, however, does not report the attempt of the women to anoint the dead body, it would follow that he cannot be

²⁰Mark 14:3.

²¹John 12:3.

²²John 12:3.

²³John 12:7.

²⁴Mark 16:1ff.

²⁵Luke 23:56ff.

²⁶John 12:3.

²⁷Mark 16:1.

²⁸Luke 24:10.

the original author of the phrase; he must have taken it over from a source which still did report, and attach great importance to, the women's plan. We should have before us, that is, a pre-Johannine nuance of the saying of Jesus at Bethany.

Mary, then, is to keep it for that subsequent occasion; her present action, her present gesture of reverence, adumbrates what she will do, or attempt to do, when Jesus is dead. In this connection, it should be observed that, having anointed Jesus' feet, she dries the ointment with her hair.²⁹ This is a very strange feature in John's version. It will, however, appear less strange if we assume that this version grew out of another, in fact out of one like that preserved in Luke,³⁰ where a penitent woman washed his feet with her tears, dried them with her hair and then anointed them. In John, the washing is omitted, in order to achieve a closer foreshadowing of the anointing after death. Only the drying is still retained, illogically and with an awkward result.

(2) However, there is a well-known difficulty about the rendering 'that she may keep the ointment': one would expect 'that she may keep the rest', τὸ περισσεῦον or the like. It may, therefore, be permissible to point out that τηρέω is capable of a different translation, though it seems here less natural and is probably to be rejected: 'to remember', 'to keep in one's memory'. The words might signify: 'that she may remember it, keep it in her memory'—*scil.* the ointment in question, or (but this would be reading a great deal into αὐτό) this incident. This rendering would at least not involve the difficulty described. The woman is to remember the ointment with which she anointed Jesus' feet (or the entire incident); so τὸ περισσεῦον is not wanted.

Three other passages with derivatives of τηρέω come to mind: Luke 2:19, Mary συνετήρει τὰ ρήματα ταῦτα, Luke 2:51, Jesus' mother διετήρει πάντα τὰ ρήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς, and Genesis 37:11, Jacob, when Joseph had told him his dreams, διετήρει τὸ ρῆμα.³¹ In all these cases, the event remembered adumbrates, provides the understanding one with a foretaste of, the real thing to come: Joseph's dreams—his exaltation in Egypt, the shepherds and their testimony—the worship of the Church, the young Jesus amidst the doctors—

²⁹John 12:3.

³⁰Luke 7:36ff.

³¹In Hebrew: *shamar 'eth haddabhar*.

the message of the mature Jesus. Similarly—if we proceed from τηρέω in this sense—the ointment used at Bethany is remembered as foreshadowing the costlier ointment used by Joseph and Nicodemus in the most tragic circumstances.

Should this be the meaning of John, there are two possibilities. Either John had before him a version of the narrative with no reference to Jesus' burial whatever—a version of the kind we find in Luke²²—and he himself turned the incident into one foreshadowing the final anointing by Joseph and Nicodemus. That is to say, he himself suppressed the woman's contrition and tears (with the impossible result that she dries the ointment with her hair²³) and introduced the clauses 'Let her alone in order that she may remember . . .' and 'For the poor always . . .' This solution, however, is extremely unlikely. Once it was made clear that Jesus' body was actually anointed after his death in the proper mode, there was no need for violent interference with an entirely different kind of anointing during his life.

Or John had before him a version with προέλαβεν, a version which, like Mark,²⁴ saw in the anointing at Bethany a present, proleptic performance of the burial rite. As John taught that Jesus was in fact anointed after his death, he did not want this rite to be anticipated. Consequently, he eliminated the fiction of a present burial, he changed anticipation, performance in advance, of the rite into adumbration, he cut out the description of the woman's action as 'a good work' and toned down προέλαβεν into 'that she may remember it against the day when Joseph and Nicodemus will actually observe the ritual in the prescribed manner'.

It should, however, be observed that the version before him was only like Mark—namely, in insisting on a burial rite in advance—but it cannot have been Mark itself. In Mark, the head is anointed, in the version before John it was still the feet; in Mark, there is no drying of the ointment with the hair, in the version before John it still occurred. In other words, the version before John, though already containing προέλαβεν, the fiction of the burial rite here and now, had not yet, like Mark, drawn out all consequences; it had not yet, like Mark, shed those two vestiges of an earlier stage when the

²²Luke 7:36ff.

²³John 12:3.

²⁴Mark 14:8.

narrative simply concerned a penitent woman paying homage to Jesus.

If the idea of *τηρέω* here denoting 'to remember' can be entertained at all, the second of the two possibilities outlined is preferable to the first. John knew a 'proto-Markan' version, and gave up the fiction of a present burial in favour of an adumbration—to be remembered—of a future, real one.

IV. MATTHEW

Matthew is fairly close to Mark. As in Mark, the incident takes place after the entry into Jerusalem, very near Passover. True, the box is not broken.²⁸ But the ointment is poured over Jesus' head²⁹ and also, quite clearly, over his body: *βαλοῦσα γὰρ αὐτῇ τὸ μόγον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου.*³⁰ Jesus' reply consists of three parts, and is designed to prove the superiority of the woman's action, as constituting a burial rite, over almsgiving.³¹ And *πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με ἔποίησεν*, 'she hath done it for my burial',³² expresses performance of the burial rite here and now no less strongly than *προέλαβεν* etc., 'she is come beforehand to anoint my body'.³³ Accordingly—the most significant fact from the point of view of the thesis advocated—Matthew, like Mark, has no anointing after death.³⁴

Where they differ, Matthew as a rule appears secondary. For example,

(1) *προέλαβεν* etc., in Mark,³⁵ is the formulation of somebody still wrestling with the problem, somebody who must explain how an anointing of the living Jesus could stand for one after his death, while Matthew's simple *ἔπιησεν*³⁶ indicates that the solution has been accepted: she has performed the burial rite—the fact that it is done by anticipation, the element of fiction, is no longer even hinted at.

(2) Similarly, in Mark, that the ointment poured over Jesus' head covered his body is only indirectly conveyed, implied, in the inter-

²⁸Matthew 26:7.

²⁹Matthew 26:7.

³⁰Matthew 26:12.

³¹Matthew 26:10ff.

³²Matthew 26:12.

³³Mark 14:8.

³⁴Matthew 27:57ff.

³⁵Mark 14:8.

³⁶Matthew 26:12.

pretation of the action: 'she is come aforehand to anoint my body for the burying'.⁴⁴ In Matthew also, it comes in the interpretation, but quite explicitly: 'for in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial'.⁴⁵

(3) That Mark is not yet comfortable may be inferred from 'she hath done what she could'⁴⁶—absent from Matthew. Mark is still conscious of the burial rite at Bethany being a second best, an 'as if'. Matthew no longer shares this feeling.

(4) That Matthew is completely satisfied may be inferred from his omitting the attempt of the women to anoint the dead Jesus⁴⁷—still extant in Mark.⁴⁸ The omission is striking. Matthew doubtless held that such an attempt was not only superfluous after the performance of the rite at Bethany, but even apt to weaken the definitive πρὸς τὸ ἔνταφιάσω με ἐπίησεν.⁴⁹

(5) One little interpolation in the section about Joseph of Arimathaea is revealing as to the whole tendency governing the matter. Neither Mark nor Matthew has an anointing after death, but Matthew makes 'a clean linen cloth'⁵⁰ of Mark's 'linen cloth'.⁵¹ Evidently, the unassuming burial was a difficulty. In New Testament times, even poor people practised luxury as regards burial clothes for their relatives;⁵² a plain linen cloth would be a sign of shame.

Here may be the place to mention two further points very possibly connected with this aspect of Jesus' burial, though it is not Matthew alone whose changes are significant.

(1) In Mark, Jesus is buried in 'a grave'⁵³—any grave. All we can say is that it is not the grave of his family, a serious matter: persons executed were not immediately buried in the family grave.⁵⁴ In Luke⁵⁵ and John,⁵⁶ it is a new grave. To be sure, this characteristic may have a purely magical import, or perhaps a generally senti-

⁴⁴Mark 14:8.

⁴⁵Matthew 26:12.

⁴⁶Mark 14:8.

⁴⁷Matthew 28:1ff.

⁴⁸Mark 16:1ff.

⁴⁹Matthew 26:12.

⁵⁰Matthew 27:59.

⁵¹Mark 15:46.

⁵²See above, n. 8.

⁵³Mark 15:46.

⁵⁴Mishnah Sanhedrin 6:5.

⁵⁵Luke 23:53.

⁵⁶John 19:41.

mental one. But it is possible to see something more specific behind it. Persons executed, as we just remarked, were not immediately buried in the family grave; the court kept two plots for their provisional burial, i.e. for a year or so.⁶⁷ The meaning in Luke and John may be that the grave is not one of these public ones. In Matthew,⁶⁸ it is Joseph's own new family grave.

(2) It has long been seen that the description of Jesus' dead body as πτῶμα, extant in Mark 15:43 and 45, is more primitive than σῶμα which is used by the other gospels.⁶⁹ Once again, the change may indeed be owing to the general consideration that σῶμα is more respectful than πτῶμα. But here, too, the more specific factor may have played a part. πτῶμα, corresponding to *pegher* in Hebrew, *peghar* or *pigra'* in Aramaic, is particularly suitable for describing a mutilated corpse, and thus a corpse mutilated in the course of an execution.⁷⁰ An illustration occurs in the New Testament itself, where the beheaded Baptist is buried: ἤραν τὸ πτῶμα.⁷¹ The Pharisees had a horror of death penalties involving the destruction or a major disfigurement of the body; that was a *niwwul*, 'disgrace'.⁷² The word πτῶμα, as applied to Jesus, would suggest a breaking of the legs—emphatically ruled out by John.⁷³ The very emphasis (coupled with the note that the disfigurement was proposed by the Jews⁷⁴) indicates that he is warding off an attack. If the Jews were chiefly

⁶⁷Mishnah Sanhedrin 6:6.

⁶⁸Matthew 27:60.

⁶⁹Matthew 27:58, Luke 23:52, 55, John 19:38, 40. Even in Mark 15:43, σῶμα has ousted πτῶμα in a number of MSS, e.g. Codex Bezae.

⁷⁰For the use of *pegher* etc., see the dictionaries. Isaiah 14:9 may serve as an example: 'But thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with a sword, that go down to the stones of the pit, as a carcass trodden under feet'. The word 'carcass' represents *pegher* in the Hebrew, *peghar* in the Targum.

⁷¹Matthew 14:12, Mark 6:29. In Matthew, the Koine reading is σῶμα, clearly secondary.

⁷²See e.g. Mishnah Sanhedrin 7:1, 3, 9:3. Babylonian Babha Bathra 8b, Sanhedrin 52a f. For a detailed discussion, see A. Büchler, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, vol. 50, pp. 550ff., 683ff. and 704ff.

⁷³John 19:31ff. The importance of the point may be gathered from two reforms urged by the Pharisees in that period. First, the death penalty of burning, they urged, should be performed, not by burning the victim, but by forcing material set on fire down his throat, this mode of execution avoiding destruction of the body and, indeed, being less severe (in their eyes) than stoning, which might smash it. Secondly, stoning should be performed, not by pelting the victim to death with stones—which meant breaking his skull, legs etc.—but by pushing him down from a moderate height; if this did not suffice, a stone was to be dropped on his heart; and only if he was not dead even then, was recourse to be had to stoning proper.

⁷⁴John 19:31.

shocked by, and commenting on, the abject form of Jesus' suffering,⁶⁸ πτῶμα supported their case in much the same way as the non-observance of a common burial rite. It is interesting that it is John who does both: (a) introduce an actual anointing after death, and (b) expressly testify to the intactness of the body.

V. LUKE: THE GROWTH OF THE NARRATIVE

The clue to the different versions of the anointing at Bethany lies in the recognition that the development of the narrative was determined by the wish to get rid of the shameful burial; a wish understandable in itself, but in all probability stimulated by the Jewish attitude to the 'scandal' of Jesus' end.

It looks as if we ought to start from Luke. He knows nothing of the anointing by Joseph and Nicodemus,⁶⁹ and the women come too late.⁷⁰ Neither, however, is there any allusion to Jesus' death in the chapter about the sinful woman who anoints him while he lives.⁷¹ (We do not meet with the phrase 'good work', which would fit so well if it had the vague sense of any fine deed. Its absence confirms the technical interpretation we have put on it in Mark⁷² and Matthew.⁷³) This incident—not yet located at Bethany—is right outside the passion cycle, and the woman does not pour ointment over Jesus' head, but washes with her tears, dries with her hair and anoints Jesus' feet.⁷⁴ While there may be secondary elements, on the whole, Luke stands nearest the original tradition; and it is noteworthy that, in depicting the action of the woman, John is close to Luke except for the omission of her tears in favour of an exclusive stress on the anointing of the feet.⁷⁵ Of course, he has the complaint about the waste, and the reply 'Let her alone in order that . . .' and 'For the poor always . . .'—all foreign to Luke.

The following stages in the evolution of the tradition regarding Jesus' burial are conceivable.

(1) A woman washed with her tears, dried with her hair and

⁶⁸Cp. above, n. 9.

⁶⁹Luke 23:50ff.

⁷⁰Luke 23:56ff.

⁷¹Luke 7:36ff.

⁷²Mark 14:6. See above, under II (2).

⁷³Matthew 26:10. See above, under IV, at the beginning.

⁷⁴Luke 7:38.

⁷⁵John 12:9.

anointed Jesus' feet while he lived. After his death, nobody anointed or attempted to anoint his body. This stage is not preserved in any of our sources.

(2) The disgrace of the burial was mitigated by introducing an attempt of some women to anoint the corpse.⁷³ They could not carry out their plan because, in the meantime, Jesus had risen. This was a justification of their failure more than sufficient for the faithful. But why had they not come earlier? Because 'they rested on the sabbath day according to the commandment'.⁷⁴ This ought to silence the Jewish questioners. They could not say anything against strict compliance with the Law, which prohibited any buying—and therefore the buying of spices—on a Sabbath.⁷⁵

This stage of the tradition is preserved in Luke. Its distinctive mark is that the non-observance of the rite of anointing is still admitted; only it is claimed that it resulted not from a treatment of the body as that of a criminal, but from keeping the Sabbath and the resurrection immediately afterwards. The non-observance of the rite is explained, but not yet explained away, still less flatly denied.

(3a) One possibility is that the incident at Bethany was now made into an adumbration of the women's attempt to anoint the dead body—perhaps in order to endow that attempt with greater weight. (It had, after all, failed.) This might explain the account to be found in John, if we render ἵνα τηρήσῃ αὐτό⁷⁶ by 'that she may keep the ointment'. The naming of Mary⁷⁷ as well as the omission of the woman's tears, with the impossible result that what she dries with her hair is the ointment,⁷⁸ would fit: these features can be ascribed to a desire to effect a closer foreshadowing of the attempt after Jesus' death.

However, the development just outlined, though it produced the account given by John, would have to be pre-Johannine. For John himself discards the attempt of the women to anoint the corpse,

⁷³They attempt to anoint it with spices, not with oil. The problem is analogous to that created by John 19:39f. See above, n. 19.

⁷⁴Luke 23:56; cp. Mark 16:1.

⁷⁵Mark's argument, very forceful, is that the spices could not be bought (Mark 16:1; see H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 52f.). Luke assumes that the act of anointing itself was forbidden on a Sabbath (Luke 23:56). By the time of the Mishnah, however, it was allowed: Mishnah Shabbath 23:5.

⁷⁶John 12:7.

⁷⁷John 12:3; cp. Mark 16:1, Luke 24:10.

⁷⁸John 12:3.

asserting that there was successful anointing by Joseph and Nicodemus. So he himself would not have connected the anointing at Bethany with that attempt. He himself simply denies that there was any kind of neglect at the time of Jesus' burial.

(3b) If we take *ἴνα τηρήσῃ αὐτό* as denoting 'that she may remember it against the day when Joseph and Nicodemus will anoint the body', there is a remote possibility that John himself turned a contrite washing and anointing of the feet into an adumbration of the final anointing by two faithful men. The omission of the tears, with its queer result, and the sayings from 'Let her alone' onwards⁷⁰ would be due to himself.

(3c) However, should this interpretation of *ἴνα . . .* be adopted at all, it is better to suppose that John proceeded from a more advanced stage than that represented by Luke; namely, from a stage where the anointing at Bethany was already thought of as anticipating the burial rite, as constituting an anointing for burial here and now—though it is still the feet that are anointed and there is still drying with the hair. As John had the actual rite after death, he changed *προέλαβεν*,⁷¹ performance in advance, into *ἴνα τηρήσῃ*, prophetic adumbration to be remembered against the actual performance, and he dropped the reference to 'a good work on me'.⁷²

(4) Mark, who does not know the anointing by Joseph and Nicodemus, far from giving up *προέλαβεν* and the 'good work', follows out some further implications of the idea of a present burial rite. He puts the story after the entry into Jerusalem, immediately before the crucifixion; replaces the anointing of the feet by a breaking of the box and pouring of the ointment over Jesus' head (and body);⁷³ and suppresses the drying. At the same time, he still retains the

⁷⁰John 12:7f.

⁷¹Mark 14:8.

⁷²Mark 14:6. If John had before him a version similar to Mark, did it contain some praise corresponding to Mark 14:9, 'wherever this gospel shall be preached . . . this also that she hath done shall be spoken of? It is probably too fanciful to assume that it did, and that it is represented in John by the last few words of 12:3, 'and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment'. Still, it may be worth recalling that the Rabbis liken Abraham before he went out to preach the true religion to a flask of perfume stored away so that its odour cannot spread; and that, in their view, 'precious ointment spreads from the bedchamber to the dining-room, but a good name spreads from one end of the world to the other.' See Genesis Rabba on 12:1, Ecclesiastes Rabba on 1:3, 7:1; both passages are quoted by H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 986, vol. 2, p. 547.

⁷³Mark 14:3, 8.

attempt of the women after Jesus' death;⁸³ and there are other signs—such as 'she hath done what she could'⁸⁴—that he is conscious that his account, *au fond*, constitutes an explaining away of the facts.

(5) Matthew, finally, takes over the Markan solution, but with far more confidence. Its problematic nature is no longer felt, as is shown by several details, such as the omission of 'she hath done what she could' and the straightforward ἐποίησεν.⁸⁵ The most notable innovation in this respect is the abandonment of the attempt of the women to anoint the corpse as superfluous.

⁸³Mark 16:1ff.

⁸⁴Mark 14:8.

⁸⁵Matthew 26:12.

THE PROPHET ISAIAH

By W. NORMAN PITTINGER

General Theological Seminary

The prophet Isaiah is traditionally regarded as that one of the Jewish prophetic succession who most clearly enunciated the belief in a coming deliverer who would lead the nation from evil and oppression into a new service of God which would establish it as the light of the whole world. And as a result he is associated, in the Christian Church, with the foretelling of the incarnation of God in Christ. Modern criticism has required us to recast our conception of the work of the prophet; and yet there is much justification for retaining the view that Isaiah is the man who did as a matter of fact do much to prepare for the whole complex of ideas which the Jews associate with the Messiah and which Christians therefore associate with our Lord as the fulfiller of the messianic hope.

As this paper develops, we hope that this point can be made plain to the reader. For Isaiah was called by God to bring a message to a people who would reject it—sure from the first that there was no possibility of success for his mission; yet he carried out his task, waiting patiently for the manifestation of God in destruction. He was equally certain, however, that a remnant would be saved, who also would wait for the Lord and who would go through the fire of

persecution and oppression, but who in the end would be the true Israel. As the life of the prophet unrolls before us, in the reconstruction made possible by modern Biblical criticism, we see a man who is seized, as were the earlier prophets, by the sense of the power of God; who was forced to engage upon a dangerous and fateful mission, to suffer for it, and finally (as it would appear) to be rejected because he would not swerve one iota from the message which he felt called upon to deliver. Likewise, in his notion that the greatness of the nation was shown by whatever devotion it had to the will of God, and that only by turning to him whatever salvation was available might be secured, he prepared the way for the final Christian conception of greatness, on the one hand, and of salvation, on the other—both of them through and through spiritual, both of them vindicated by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Isaiah had his first vision, which we know as his call, in the temple at Jerusalem in the year in which King Uzziah died. Evidently he had long meditated on the problems facing the people whom he loved so dearly; perhaps in the course of his mental struggle he had gone up into the national place of worship. At any rate, it was while he was in the courts of the temple that he "saw the Lord high and lifted up." The experience which he underwent is recounted in the sixth chapter of Isaiah; it was in line with mystical experience generally: the prophet was carried away by his vision and saw, almost with bodily eyes, that the power and holiness of God filled the entire creation. This power and holiness came upon him to bring the conviction that a man has his significance only as the instrument of the power of Jahweh and the spokesman of his holiness. No evil nor hatred can endure in God's sight. The only reason for the world and its only meaning are to be found in the all-powerful, all-pure, all-holy, all righteous one God. And this God of Isaiah is a God who permits men to enter into an intimate, but hardly "chummy," relationship with him, who has a personal mission for men, and whose destroying power is used to purge and not merely to annihilate that which is contrary to his will.

God seen in the vision of Isaiah stands in a very definite relationship to human life, even though it is true that in the light of his majesty humanity sinks into relative insignificance. The relationship must mean for men faithful obedience to God and knowledge of (that is, intimate communion—as in Hosea's sense of the word) him;

it involves loving service of God who has brought the Jewish people into the promised land and has prepared for them a future—but a future which can only be achieved (as Isaiah in his later years came clearly to see) by a small remnant who will patiently await it, trusting in God and not in human action, and always remembering that “he that believeth shall not be moved.”

In the strength of his vision and with a keen sense of vocation—that he had been given a message which he must deliver, now that he had replied to God’s voice by saying “Here am I; send me”—Isaiah, purified by the touch of holy fire from God’s throne, goes forth to announce to the people of Judah the old prophetic message that inevitable destruction will soon come upon the nation because of its sins. It was to come, as of old, through Assyria, now descending upon the Mediterranean world like a wild beast. But it was not to be mere destruction; while the nation would be wiped out, yet Isaiah taught symbolically by the name which he gave to his son that a small part would be saved, and upon this remnant God would build a new Israel, to serve him from the heart.

Isaiah’s advice to the royal party—that in view of the onrush of destructive forces, under divine control, diplomatic negotiations first with Assyria then as a desperate device with Egypt were fruitless—was disregarded. His preaching had been in vain. Perhaps he had hoped, almost against hope, that somehow through the nation’s obedience to God the coming destruction might be averted. We do not know. But in any case none heeded his warning; the destruction approached. And then, the threat did not materialize; the Assyrian did not come to Judah. The prophecy of Isaiah seemed to have failed of fulfilment. None the less, he remained firm in his conviction that God would visit his people in destruction; and through the long years he waited quietly for that coming of God which he knew must occur.

The north *had* been destroyed, but not Judah. Yet when once again Isaiah came forth with a public prophecy, after his long years of patient waiting, his message was simply a reiteration of his earlier warning that destruction would take place. And in an hour of crisis Judah relied once more on political tricks. In a vain effort to avert the coming catastrophe, an alliance was formed with Egypt. But Sennacherib overwhelmingly defeated the coalition of Egypt, Judah and other small states; and Hezekiah, the king of Judah,

made abject submission to the Assyrians. But Jerusalem was not destroyed; before this could be accomplished there was a sudden and unexpected withdrawal of the invading armies. The reason for this is not clear: a plague is perhaps the explanation. But even with the capital saved, Isaiah did not turn from his task of preaching the doom of the nation. He had a message; and he was convinced that be it late or soon that message would surely be fulfilled, even if not in his own lifetime.

Of course it was eventually fulfilled. In the long run, Isaiah had been entirely correct and Judah could not be saved. And again he was right in teaching that a small remnant would be left, a faithful few who would be loyal to God and upon whom as a foundation Jahweh could build his new Jerusalem. For after the collapse of the nation, there were still some who remained true; their seed was not wiped out. And from this little group, the finest flower of faithful Judaism sprang, and out of it, eventually, Christ was to be born in Bethlehem of Judaea.

Throughout the course of his life, Isaiah remained true to his first vision of God as the holy one of Israel, the high God who dwells in light unapproachable. His experience of God belonged clearly to the order of the numinous—in Otto's now famous description. Jahweh for him was unspeakably pure in his majesty; man could see only a bit of his glory; man could glimpse but his manward side. And because God was so high and holy, and man so insignificant excepting as he becomes the instrument of God and his purposes, the sin which most clearly cuts off the soul from the divine power and the nation from the presence of Jahweh, is pride and self-sufficiency. It is against the assertion of man's independence, of the supposed value of man as man without reference to God, that Isaiah continually inveighs. The king and his advisors think that they can save the nation by political action, by coalition, by large armies, that is to say by human means; Isaiah knows that it is only by knowledge and service of God that the people can be saved. It is only by this that the little remnant was saved. The nation's continued disobedience and pride have made the possibility of salvation, he declares, remote if not utterly impossible.

The only intimate knowledge of God possible for man is that given by patient waiting upon him. For the prophet, God is like the little stream of Shiloah which waters Jerusalem; he is to be

known in and by his quiet, persistent work in human life. Here is a paradox, which Isaiah does not bother to resolve: God is high, almost unknowable; yet he is genuinely known in the ordinary ways of devotion and in the plain things of life. It is because men will not seek for him and serve him there, the prophet says, that he is compelled forcibly to manifest his power "as the great river." It is because they *could* know him, in a tender personal sense, and yet have disobeyed him time and time again, that they will see, enacted terribly on the stage of history, his awful majesty and power in destructive act.

It is the very fact of these paradoxes that makes the religious insight of his prophet so significant. God is cosmic force and power, he is mysterious and well-nigh unknown; still he *is* known and available to man in simple ways. He is above men, and they are insignificant in his presence; yet he has a purpose for them which it is his will that they should carry out, and in that fashion secure some significance for their lives. Despite the sense of doom which fills so much of the prophet's oracles, there is no doubt that one of the deepest notes in his thought is the insistence upon what we should call love towards the transcendent God and personal relationship with him.

Such a profound faith in religious experience, as our modern language has it, comes out much more clearly in Jeremiah, but it is surely deep in the thought and feeling of Isaiah. It is this experience—with the sense of a personal vocation, a personal communion with God—which, when coupled with the notion of the saving remnant, gives Isaiah his special importance as one who prepared the way for the coming of Christ. Taking the insight of the early prophets, Isaiah portrays God and man as capable of fellowship—although that fellowship is prevented from deteriorating into mere "chumminess" by the strong sense of awe and the continued insistence on the divine transcendence and holiness.

THE IDEA OF FREEDOM IN THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLE PAUL

By HANS WEDELL

Pfarrhaus, Repelen

Kr. Moers, Nord-Rheinland

Germany

I

Ernest Renan in the final chapter of his book, *Saint Paul*, in which he gives a concentrated critical summary of his work, declares: "In our days the reign of the apostle is drawing to a close." But this prophecy has not proved true, at least as far as the real Paul and the essence of his message are concerned. On the contrary. From the beginning of the XXth Century, more and more scholars have been endeavoring to clarify Paul's life and ideas, his struggle to introduce his Master, the Risen Lord, into the pagan world. I refer to the writings of such men as Adolf Deissmann, Heinrich Weinel, Karl Barth, Paul Feine, Albert Schweitzer, Arthur Darby Nock, Donald Wayne Riddle, to mention only a few.

Beyond that a great many scholars discuss the wider aspects of the teaching of Paul. Again the name of Karl Barth appears; further on, the name of his friend and adversary, Emil Brunner, and that of Reinhold Niebuhr. There is a special reason to mention his book, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, Vol. I. Georgia Harkness, participating in a symposium upon this book published in *Christendom* (1941, pp. 567-582), points to the fact that in the index of scripture-passages we find forty-two citations from the writings of Paul. Certainly she does not overestimate "the simple mathematics of enumeration." But it is interesting to realize the extent to which this contemporary scholar deals with and refers to the ideas of Paul. We can agree when in the preface to his recent book, *The Thought of St. Paul in the Light of the Modern World*, Eric Montizambert observes:

Nothing is quite so impressive as the recent advance of the the-

ology of St. Paul into the foreground of religious thought. Theological debate is again centering upon the Pauline writings.

The aim of this brief study is to examine again the idea of freedom as it is represented in the doctrine of Paul. I use the expression "again" purposely. The noted German scholar Johannes Weiss once published a lecture entitled *Die Christliche Freiheit nach der Verkündigung des Apostels Paulus* (Christian Freedom According to the Teaching of the Apostle Paul.) This was in the year 1902. Since then, the understanding of what is the essence of Paul's theology has advanced decidedly. Therefore it seems justifiable to re-examine this his idea of freedom which is an essential part of his whole teaching. Our investigation will show that Paul's conception is quite modern and really presents a challenge for the present and the future of our world.

II

According to Johannes Weiss, Paul's idea of freedom has its roots in Greek philosophy, especially in the Stoic doctrine. He stresses the thought that Paul must have attended a school of rhetoric. That the idea of freedom is a notion which the apostle received from others is recognizable, he points out, from the fact that he does not apply this thought in a uniform way as he would do in the case of an original conception. It has in it something iridescent; it is turned around to the one side or the other according to the context, now with this, now with that meaning. Weiss emphasizes the great affinity between Paul and the Stoics, even extending to the same mode of expression. Especially he tries to construe a relationship with Seneca (4-65 A.D.) and Epictetus (around 50-130 A.D.). Of course Weiss knows that the latter taught a full generation after Paul's lifetime. To obviate the objection that for this reason Paul could not have been influenced by Epictetus, Weiss advances the argument that Epictetus merely offers in his speeches a summary of what generations of older teachers had taught a hundred times before him. Freedom, of course, is a notion generally used by the Stoics, especially in the context: "Only the wise man is free." Paul had only to go to the market-place in his home town, Tarsus, to hear explanations of freedom by stoic-cynic itinerant speakers.

But Weiss himself admits that the notion of freedom is to be

found in occasional passages in the Fourth Book of Maccabees and that James in his epistle speaks of "the law of liberty" (1:25; 2:12). We know that the entrance of Greek philosophy into Jewish theology goes back to the middle of the second century B.C. It is possible, indeed likely, that Paul heard about Stoic philosophers and also about the notion of freedom in the rabbinical school of Tarsus or Jerusalem, together with the comments of his teachers; but assuredly there is no good reason for the assumption that the Apostle Paul is dependent on Stoic philosophy, even though it is likely that he was informed about Greek philosophy, knowledge of which he increased on his journeys, and certainly especially during his stays in Greece, I Cor. 1:18-25; Col. 2:8, 20 and 21, and Gal. 4:3 and 9: the "rudiments" or the "elements" of the world; also Acts 17:17-34.

His conception of freedom is a product of the main trend in his whole theology. And this is not so much justification by faith as the idea of *union with Christ*, his conviction of *being in Christ*. We can take this as the now unanimous opinion of scholars. From this central point, all other thoughts spread like rays of the sun. From the time of the Damascus event, Paul was "apprehended" by Christ, Phil. 3:12, permeated by His spirit, or as Paul himself declares: "I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me," Gal. 2:20.

This focal point, Paul's overwhelming certainty of being in Christ, establishes the point that his theology is not mainly of an eschatological trend. He emphasizes the fact that justification by faith is a *present event* (for instance, Gal. 3:8, 24 and 25), that we have to fulfill the law of Christ, to bring forth fruit unto God (Rom. 7:4) during our lifetime. Here we meet with the idea of "realized eschatology," a conception which was advanced by Prof. C. H. Dodd and has been supported by Prof. F. C. Grant in his article under this title (*Christendom*, 1941, pp. 82-95). In the same way Paul Feine, a scholar who has devoted his life-work to the investigation of Paul's theology, points out that in the apostle's teaching for the first time a line of thought arises which is destined to undermine the eschatology of the earliest Christians and to take away its exclusive importance. The line is this, that we have the experience of the certainty of salvation *already in this life*. (*Der Apostel Paulus: Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus*, 1927.) The revolutionary or radical trend of Paul's theology does not root exclusively in his eschatology. The whole of his teaching is based on

the idea of being in Christ, and that means that the certainty of redemption begins in this world here and now: we are not restricted to the hope of salvation in the resurrection after death.

III

Upon this foundation of Paul's theology his idea of freedom arises.

The first point is: personal inner freedom. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," II Cor. 3:17. It is the same idea which Jesus Himself expresses with these words: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," John 8:36. He who is in Christ looks upon his surroundings with more than physical eyes. He feels independent of all men, low and high, in word and deed. And yet he knows he has to serve: he is bound in Christ. This idea is expressed by Paul in I Cor. 9:1, where he is asking: "Am I not free?" and again in the same chapter, verse 19: "For though I am free from all men yet have I made myself servant unto all." He who is in Christ has courage and the knowledge where and when to go into action. In Phil. 4:13 Paul exclaims: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

Because he is permeated by this inner freedom he knows where to use leniency and where to be stern. Because he is free the grace is given to him to convince the "pillars," James, Cephas, and John, at the first Apostolic Council so that they tender him the right hand of fellowship and agree that he and Barnabas should go to the heathen, Gal. 2:9. Because he is free Paul feels it necessary to withstand Peter and Barnabas publicly in Antioch, in the presence of the whole body of Christians, Gal. 2:13 and 14. And it was not an easy task to blame either Peter, who was very close to Jesus, nor Barnabas, who was his friend.

Johannes Weiss characterizes this as "freedom from the world, its joy and suffering" (l.c., pp. 24ff). He sees only a negative side in Paul's idea of freedom—the ability to liberate one's self inwardly from this world. The reason for this restriction lies in Weiss's endeavor to compare Paul's with Stoic thoughts, especially with the tenets of Epictetus. In his last footnote he even goes so far as to quote Seneca *Ad Marciam de Consolatione* 245.25.1 as a hint for the understanding of II Cor. 5, 1ff. Weiss's conception is too negative, and therefore too narrow. The apostle who also proclaims that God has shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the

glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (II Cor. 4:6) has a positive belief in freedom.

The next point is: freedom from sin, freedom from the law, and freedom from death. If we have apprehended "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" we have acquired freedom from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2). We are able to overcome death. If we live in Christ we enjoy freedom from the law.

It is interesting to note, parenthetically, how according to Paul's thinking freedom from the law is limited. There are always people who cannot act according to a great idea. They need certain rules. And there are always people who misapply a spiritual gift by using it to excess and so really degrade it, misunderstanding its purity and holiness. Against both these dangers Paul had to be on his guard.

We know Paul's severe and passionate struggles with the so-called Judaizers. They maintained that the road to Christ goes by way of Moses. They wished to force the Gentiles to observe the Jewish law, thus limiting their freedom. They did not see that really Jesus Himself had gone beyond the law. They clung to the letter, mistaking ceremonial rites for the essential truths in Christ's teaching. Paul realized quite clearly that he must raze the wall of the law. There must be an immediate access for the heathen to Christ. Christ is the end of the law.

These Judaizers came down to Antioch. They intruded into the Galatian Churches. Very probably they were also found in Corinth (II Cor. 11:22). Perhaps there they belonged to another branch. At least the subject of the controversy is different. For this reason the inference has been drawn that they joined with Paul's adversaries of the other wing.

The latter represent an opposite danger. It is difficult to gain a clear picture of the essential aims of the group. They were 'pneumatici,' connected to a certain extent with gnostic ideas, or we may say: spiritualistic radicals, a characterization given them by James Hardy Ropes (*The Singular Problem of Galatians*, Harvard Theological Studies XIV, p. 25). At any rate they believed themselves to be filled with the Christ-spirit in a special way: some scholars identify them with the so-called Christ-party (see I Cor. 1:12; perhaps II Cor. 10:7 is also a reference to this party). Their slogan was: all things are lawful unto us. There is no boundary. Whatever

we may do, even if we commit fornication, that does not affect our faith. Paul tries to confine this exaggerated feeling of strength to its right limits. He teaches that it really means undergoing a new serfdom, the serfdom of the harlot, and is besides a sin against the idea of Christian freedom, a sin against Christ, because the body also is for the Lord. (I Cor. 6:12-20). We must restrict our freedom, if the interest of the whole church is at stake.

The same consideration has weight in our relation to our fellow-Christians. In the Corinthian Church and much more in the Church of Rome, the ceremonial laws have become a stumbling block. (I Cor. 10:23-32; Rom. 14). The "strong" have no objection, but the conscience of the "weak" is troubled. In Rome some go so far as to abstain from eating meat at all. They are vegetarians. At any cost they wish to avoid the danger of eating meat which has been offered to an idol. Moreover, some refuse to drink wine as if it were unclean (teetotalism). And there are also those who esteem one day above another. The strong are inclined to despise their brethren for their weaknesses. But Paul forbids those who are stong, who are conscious of their freedom, to pursue their free course without considering the weak. He protects the weak against the misuse of freedom. He goes so far as to demand that the strong neither eat meat nor drink wine nor do anything whereby their brother may stumble or be caused to offend (Rom. 14:21).

The attitude of the apostle toward "the weak" has been attacked and criticized—for instance by Weinel, probably under the influence of Renan. He points out that Paul failed to see that just as the Judaizers had done, so now these "weaker brethren" threatened to degrade Christianity to the point where the mark of true Christianity would no longer be the clean heart but "clean food." Apparently the apostle did not see such a danger. His idea was not that the strong should generally forego their conviction, but only that they should limit their action as they came in touch with the weak. Love is more important than freedom. Freedom is limited by love. We may think also of Emil Brunner's formulation in *The Divine Imperative* (p. 306): "The life of sacrifice is the Christian's freedom, the Christian's patent of nobility."

The third point, reaching the climax of Paul's idea of freedom is: all who have put on Christ are free and equal. It is the idea of the

universality of Christianity. All distinctions are abolished. The apostle proclaims this thought with extraordinary force and vigor. He mainly uses three antitheses:

- (a) Neither Jew nor Greek (three variations, Gal. 3:28; I Cor. 12:13; Col. 3:11).
- (b) Neither bond nor free (likewise three variations, the same quotations).
- (c) Neither male nor female (just one antithesis in Gal. 3:28).

We can grasp the immensely radical nature of this proclamation only if we think of the situation in the external world in the lifetime of Paul. The Jews, still esteeming themselves the chosen people, did not engage in intercourse with the heathen; the slaves were at the mercy of their masters; and the women were under the tutelage of male relatives.

The apostle himself would deny that his conception was revolutionary or radical. He would maintain that what he was preaching was only the consequence of his union with Christ. Of course his teaching was restricted to the interior life of his churches. But, as is often the case, a great idea once proclaimed develops an influence far beyond the limits of which the originator has thought. The impulsive force of Christianity in the Pauline formation has been tremendous throughout the centuries, beginning with the destruction of the spirit of antiquity and the ancient empire (see Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, Vol. I, p. 87).

If we endeavor to understand to what extent and in what way Paul applied this radical conception of his *practically*, we find contradictory elements. We become aware of his basically conservative attitude. He refuses to exercise an influence on the political or social structure of the state. Nor is this part of the apostle's doctrine to be associated with his eschatology. Paul works incessantly to weld together Jewish and heathen Christians, not with a view to the world to come, but as a present necessity. The Jews are not entitled to make their boast of God, nor have the heathen the right to feel superior. Christ has overthrown "the middle wall of partition," and has made "of twain one new man." The episode at Antioch mentioned above well illustrates with what energy Paul was fighting against every attempt to raise again this middle wall. If Paul lived

in our time he would extend his admonition, adding a fourth antithesis: neither white nor colored.

Regarding the freedom of women, Gal. 3:28 is commonly viewed as setting forth the fundamental rule. Rolston in *The Social Message of the Apostle Paul* (1942) accepts this view (pp. 58 and 64): "No one can measure the effect of this principle of Paul's on the emancipation of woman." And he adds: "It has presented woman as standing before God on an equality with man. It has demanded that there should be realized on earth a society in which every woman received her rights as an immortal soul with an eternal destiny." However, in general, history does not confirm this statement. The emancipation of woman is much more a fruit of the Enlightenment period. If we are to be exact, we must acknowledge that Gal. 3:28 does not speak of woman. And to be sure Rolston does not overlook this. Paul uses the neutral gender in speaking of the redeemed: neither male nor female. He proclaims that in the union with Christ the difference of sex has no weight. This statement proves to be of a purely eschatological nature. "The man is brought out of his manhood, the woman out of her womanhood, so that they can unite entirely as the redeemed sons and daughters of God" (see Dehn, *Gesetz oder Evangelium?* p. 129). We are reminded of Jesus' saying concerning a woman who married seven brothers one after the other, Matth. 22:23-30; it is not probable that Paul knew this parable.

Although Gal. 3:28 cannot be used as a source, Paul nevertheless advanced the freedom of woman by his teaching.

Regarding the relations between man and woman in married life, he puts the woman so to speak on a higher level of dignity. He demands nothing from the woman that she cannot likewise expect from her husband (I Cor. 7). The dignity of the woman is also acknowledged by the fact—it may be by chance—that three times in this chapter she is mentioned in the first place (verses 4, 10 and 16). But on the other hand the apostle makes the statement that the head of the woman is the man (I Cor. 11:3), the woman is the glory of man (verse 8). As we learn from I Cor. 11:5, Paul admits that a woman may lead in prayer and prophesy in the Church, demanding only that she cover her head. But on the other hand he bids the woman to be silent in church meetings (I Cor. 14:33b-36).

Practically during the lifetime of Paul the position of woman was freer than it had ever been before and than it was in the surrounding heathen world. She had the opportunity to work in the church in different ways. She was also active in the real spreading of the gospel. For instance in Phil. 4:2 and 3 Paul mentions Evodia and Syntyche who had fought for the gospel with him. We know that Priscilla the wife of Aquila was engaged in missionary activity. According to Acts 18:26 she had a share in converting the learned Apollos to Christianity. But immediately after Paul, woman lost this freer position to which the apostle had admitted her. In I Tim. 2:12 we read that a woman is not allowed to teach and is not to usurp authority over the man; she is advised to be silent.

Again and again Paul deals with the situation of the slaves (apart from the general statements, in I Cor. 7:20-24 as well as in Col. 3:22-4:1 and Eph. 6:5-9; I omit I Tim., because I share the conviction that the pastoral letters are not genuinely Pauline). Apparently the apostle realizes the complicated nature and the great importance of this problem. The idea that the several solemn proclamations, "neither bond nor free", indicate that he demanded freedom for the slaves, at least as far as the Christian masters are concerned, is surely a mistaken one. Paul does not think that Christianity should inaugurate reform movements to secure a change in the political and social status of the slaves. Again we realize the conservative trend in his doctrine. He finds the solution of the problem in the spiritual sphere according to his all-governing idea: *being in Christ*, even as in "realized eschatology."

Stressing the principle, "Let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called," I Cor. 7:20, he admonishes the slaves, "Wast thou called being a bondservant? Care not for it," (cf. 21a), and in Col. 3:22: "Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh." Paul goes so far as to recommend that the slave should remain a slave even if he could gain his liberty. Christian freedom means more than secular freedom (I Cor. 7:21). He reassures the slaves comfortingly: "He who is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's Freeman." Likewise he reminds the masters that they are Christ's servants (I Cor. 7:22). The idea is that in Christ the social orders are reversed.

We are fortunate to be able to learn from the epistle to Philemon,

by a practical example, how in the mind of Paul the relations between master and slave should be settled. Onesimus, after having done his master some wrong, escaped and found his way to Paul. We do not know the particular circumstances but apparently the apostle became convinced of the sincere character of the slave who was already a Christian or was converted by him. According to law, Onesimus would have had to face the most severe punishment, perhaps condemnation to the galleys or the mines. Nevertheless Paul sends Onesimus back to Philemon. He does not ask his freedom but he recommends him to his master's clemency with these wonderfully tender words, "Receive him, not as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved both in the flesh and in the Lord."

We cannot expect far-reaching external consequences from this part of Paul's teaching. But there was a bright spark in his radical idea. And this spark kindled a fire which in the future sometimes glowed, sometimes only glimmered, but was never entirely extinguished.

We must not underestimate the psychological effect of his teaching on the slaves themselves. The slaves who were won for Christ grew in character. Origen in his apology for Christianity, *Contra Celsum* III, 54, declares the influencing of character as a special aim of Christianity in regard to slaves: "We show the slaves how they receive a free mind and can be made noble through the Logos." And then there was the sense of being at home in the church. They were treated as full members of the congregation and not as property; the standards in regard to them were the same as those in respect of the free members. It is therefore understandable that the slaves became Christians in great numbers, and that they were active in the spreading of the gospel message. We read a good deal about house-churches in Paul's epistles. He sends greetings for instance to those who are of the household of Aristobulos and Narcissus—apparently wealthy Roman citizens (Rom. 16:10 and 11). In Phil. 4:22 the saints of Caesar's household are mentioned. In Philemon, verse 2, the church is mentioned as being in his house. Nevertheless it would be a mistake to think of the oldest Christian congregations as associations of slaves, either entirely or only predominantly (see the article "Slavery and Christendom" by von Dob-schütz in *Prot. Realencyclopaedie*, XVIII, 427). Wallon in his work, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, dealing with the doctrine of

the church fathers says quite clearly (III, 362): "The masters were more numerous among the Christians."

Although it is true that in principle Christianity took over the institution of slavery as a constituent part of antique culture (v. Dob-schütz, *ibid.*), we should be under a false impression if we supposed that nothing was done to alleviate the lot of the slaves. When we read Wallon we are astonished at the extent to which the church, or rather the church fathers, were endeavoring to ameliorate their lot, not only with advice but also with the resources of the church. And in the same way the fathers were engaged unswervingly in influencing legislation, especially in the Eastern empire, in favor of the slaves. St. John Chrysostom worked out three homilies on the epistle to Philemon. He urgently asks the masters who hear him to liberate their slaves, emphasizing: "C'est Saint Paul qui les supplie lui-même pour tant d'autres Onésimes qui, peut-être mauvais esclaves, doivent les devancer, affranchis, dans la voie du salut" (Wallon, p. 360). Apparently Chrysostom understood the letter to Philemon to mean that Paul demanded of him to give Onesimus his freedom—a conception which, as we have seen, modern scholarship does not share.

IV

Looking back, we have to ask ourselves, are Paul's thoughts of freedom obsolete or do they have significance and value for our time? To find the best answer I should like to call attention to Karl Barth's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, especially to the preface to the first edition. Karl Barth points out that the apostle Paul, a child of his age, addressed his own contemporaries. But then he adds, pertinently, with great weight: "What was once of great importance is still of great importance. . . . If we rightly understand ourselves, our problems are the problems of Paul. Though we eliminate the contemporaneous garment, the eternal truths remain."

I have dealt especially with the subject of personal inner freedom (freedom of personality), the equality and freedom of all men (or in other words with the dignity of man), and finally with the freedom to serve.

If we were all filled or permeated with this inner freedom, as I have tried to explain it, that is to say as an attribute of union with

Christ, no further statement would be necessary, we could take the second and third points for granted. But unfortunately neither are all men already Christians nor are all Christians in union with Christ, Christ-minded. The second and third points still need to be underscored.

Every revolution endeavors to establish or re-establish the dignity of man. The Civil War with its essential issue of the emancipation of the slaves was based on the same great idea. Lincoln was well aware of the importance of this question. Two years after his famous proclamation (Sept. 22, 1862) he characterized it with these words: "As affairs have turned it is the central act of my administration, and the great event of the nineteenth century."

The world has recently passed through the most destructive of all wars. The conflict resulted from two opposed views of the world: on the one side the totalitarian conception, the idolizing of a certain institution (class, state, race); on the other side the democratic principle, the freedom of the individual, even the dignity of man. But despite this war, despite all public declarations of the leaders of the United Nations, the principle of the dignity of man within the orbit of the democratic world still fails to be realized wholeheartedly. Again and again, newspapers and other periodicals tell us of cases of racial discrimination. It is right and fitting that we should remember the immortal admonition of the Apostle Paul: "There can be neither Greek nor Jew, there can be neither bond nor free."

The dignity of man is a doctrine which derives also from the third point, the freedom to serve. In Paul's time the question of slavery was "the" social question. Nowadays the question of the worker in great mills or plants involves a corresponding problem. This problem had become polarized as early as the end of the nineteenth century. The church (witness Josiah Strong, Washington Gladden, and others) did not overlook its significance.

The Second World War has given a new impetus to the church to undertake again a thorough discussion of the social order, considering to a great extent the existing industrial order, all this with the special purpose of laying the foundations of social justice. Even during the conflict the Malvern Conference was assembled under the leadership of Archbishop Temple, and the Delaware Conference was called by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. It

is interesting to compare certain items of Malvern with the main idea of the Labor Sunday Message, 1942, issued by the Federal Council. The English statement emphasized the sacredness of human personality and pointed out: "A civilization or social order must be judged by the extent to which it recognizes this in practice" (*Christendom, 1941*, p. 475). The existing industrial organization was regarded as "largely responsible for the problems of the 'mass man', who is conscious of no status, spiritual or social, who is a mere item in the machinery of production." Under the headline "Industrial Management" (*ibid.* 477), we read:

the rights of labor must be recognized as in principle equal to those of capital in the control of industry, whatever the means by which this transformation is effected.

The Labor Day message put the following views into the foreground:

Labor has achieved a power which matches the power of management and ownership. These two massive powers approximately balanced with each other show a relationship of tension and frequent hostility. If a stable and sound democratic life is to be achieved it is necessary to reach a more effective harmony in the interest of all groups.

The difference of viewpoint is evident.

Interpreting these statements in terms of Pauline theology we realize that Malvern emphasized the dignity of man as a child of God, whereas the Labor Day Message stressed the idea of freedom to serve—both Pauline ideas. The teaching of the Apostle is still vital. It is indeed eternal. If we are going to rebuild the world with a sound social foundation in accordance with Christian principles, we need to take St. Paul into our counsels.

BOOK REVIEWS

How Came Our Faith. By W. A. L. Elmslie. New York: Scribner, 1949, pp. xii + 417. \$3.25.

This is a difficult book to characterize. The title would suggest a general account of the origins of the Christian Faith, but the content is concerned with the Old Testament alone. Even the sub-title, "A Study of the Religion of Israel and Its Significance for the Modern World," is misleading, since the book makes no attempt to cover the whole field of Old Testament religion, but deals only with selected aspects. Only the prophets come within the purview of the writer: the priestly writers, wise men, and poets are almost ignored. And yet one cannot even call it a book on the prophets, since the first part is a kind of general introduction to, and apologia for, the reading of the Old Testament scriptures; while the roll of the prophets is, as a fact, incomplete, since one of the greatest of them, Ezekiel, is dismissed in a foot-note. The book would perhaps be best described as "Essays on Aspects of Old Testament Religion which Appeal to Me."

To say this is not necessarily to depreciate the work, since such a highly personal volume, the result of a lifetime spent in teaching the Old Testament, might well prove to be fresh and stimulating. There is much in it which would be of interest to any reader, and certainly the person who thinks the Old Testament is outmoded and has nothing of value to offer men of today will gain from it a new understanding of the perennial vitality of the Hebrew Scriptures. For Professor Elmslie, the Hebrew prophets have been not merely the object of curious literary and linguistic studies, but companions in search for the good life, great men of genius who have found the right path and are able to show it to others.

The book is written in a discursive, chatty style which makes for easy reading and is occasionally impressive, although too often marred by the intrusion of inappropriate and (to the American) embarrassingly British slang, as when the nationalists of Amos's day are made to say, "We don't want to fight, but by jingo! if we do, we've got the men, we've got the arms, we've got Jehovah too!" Professor Elmslie's critical views are no easier to characterize than

is his book. Quite conservative in some of his opinions, he is quite radical in others. He accepts the current, though not necessarily correct, view that Ezekiel is a composite work of late and pseudonymous origin. He is one of the few scholars who accept C. C. Torrey's brilliant though unlikely theory that Second Isaiah is a product of the fourth or third century with later "Babylonian" interpolations. On the question of the prophets' attitude toward the cultus, he believes that they were radically opposed to the form, and not merely to the spirit, of worship in their day. It was their desire not merely to reform animal sacrifice but to abolish it and substitute a purely "spiritual" cult. The theory which the author advances to account for the origin of the name Yahweh is that the first element "Ya" was not originally a proper name, but rather an ejaculation used in the moon-cult, which, after becoming the name of Israel's deity, was expanded into the form "Yahweh" under the influence of a prayer formula "Ya-hweh-immanu" (Ya-be-with-us).

These examples are enough to indicate that the book is in no way a conventional one. Anyone who reads it will be convinced of the fine spirit of the author, and those who are familiar with the scholarly issues will realize that he is fully versed in the literature of present day Old Testament study—and will be glad that someone of his attainments has felt impelled to deal with the permanent religious values of the Old Testament. Unfortunately, it is not a book one can recommend generally to lay inquirers since it is so much the product of a single mind reacting to the material in its own distinctive fashion. But it may safely be said that anyone who reads it, however much he may disagree with the general point of view of the author or with his specific conclusions, will appreciate its many fine insights and will be grateful for the new evidence it brings of the power of the Old Testament to nourish in many different ways the soul of modern man.

Berkeley Divinity School

ROBERT C. DENTAN

Das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament. By Werner Georg Kümmel. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948, pp. 59. Sw. fr. 5.50.

Modern theology is so occupied with the doctrine of man that it is curious that there have been, as Professor Kümmel notes, no really satisfactory recent treatments of the N. T. doctrine of man as a whole. Kümmel seeks to remedy this defect, considering first the synoptic sayings of Jesus, then St. Paul's teaching, the Johannine theology, and the other N. T. writings.

As against Harnack's statement, that Jesus proclaimed the infinite worth of each human soul, Kümmel collects evidence to show that in Jesus' teaching man is a sinner and in this rôle stands face to face with God. On the basis of such passages as Matt. 5:9, 45; Luke 6:35, he concludes that "Jesus is no way presupposes that men are simply by nature children of God, but he *expects* God to install man as son when man through his meeting with Jesus has let himself be called to fellowship and now does God's will. Being a child of God is not a presupposition, but the eschatological purpose of the redeeming act of God" (p. 19). All this is no doubt true, but it should be added that Jesus' approach to the problem is more optimistic than that of later theologians—perhaps because he himself redeems rather than speculates about redemption.

The chapter on the Johannine doctrine of man is mainly concerned to establish that John's dualism between man and the world on the one hand, and God on the other, is "historical, not natural-static." This is correct; John does not accept the gnostic view of the world and man.

The longest part of the book is devoted to a thorough examination of the Pauline doctrine. The largest amount of biblical material, and the most difficult problems, are in Paul. Kümmel has prepared the way by his earlier monograph on *Romans 7 and the Conversion of Paul* (1929), which Nygren undertakes to criticize in his commentary on Romans. Kümmel's treatment of *sarx*, *pneuma*, and other words contains little that is not familiar to those who have read Burton's *Galatians*. He wisely points out that Paul's psychological terms are often used promiscuously; one cannot draw sharp distinctions between them (p. 24). In discussing *sarx* he argues that when it is used in contrast to *pneuma* it designates not a part of the personality but the whole man, who as sinner confronts the Creator (Rom. 7:14; 8:4; I Cor. 3:3). The notion expressed by K. Lake

and Klausner, that Paul (like Philo and the Hermetics) connects sin and flesh with matter as such, is quite properly rejected.

Like practically all professional N. T. scholars, the author regards Rom. 7:14-25 as referring to the state of the non-Christian. (It is the theologians—Emil Brunner is an exception—who follow Luther and Augustine in understanding it as “the persistence of sin in the life of the redeemed.”) Kümmel first has to deal with the mistaken assumption that the struggle portrayed in this passage is between the *nous* or mind, which belongs by nature to the realm of the Holy Spirit, and the *sarx* or flesh, which represents man’s material side. He rightly insists that St. Paul always holds man as a whole to be responsible for his deeds, and that both *nous* and *sarx* are functions of sinful man as a whole. The differences between chapters 7 and 8 are decisive. It is never said or implied that the “mind” of 7:14-25 has any contact with the Holy Spirit, while all through chapter 8 the picture is that of man who, under the Spirit’s guidance, is able to fulfill the Law’s righteous requirements. Kümmel recognizes that in 1:20-23 and 2:12-15 there is no suggestion of this ambiguous position of man, and therefore chapter 7 is unlike any other Pauline statement about the non-Christian. But there are two reasons for this: (1) Here Paul is trying to exculpate the Law from the charge that it is directly responsible for sin, and he does this by showing that man despite his evil deeds recognizes with his mind the truth and goodness of the Law. (2) The non-Christian is here looked at clearly and consistently through Christian eyes. Therefore Paul emphasizes the ambiguity of his situation, from which there is no escape, and he colors the picture of the non-Christian with that of the struggle against flesh in the Christian life (Gal. 5:17).

It is, of course, hazardous to try to systematize a non-systematic writer like St. Paul. It seems to me, however, that the difference between him and his modern interpreters is this. The latter think of the Christian as having been redeemed and then not only struggling against sin but falling into something like despair because sin comes in again, and, to use the words of Nygren, there is a tension between will and action, between intention and performance. Paul would put it this way: it is true that we never cease struggling, but the Christian has the means of winning the fight, while if he does the works of the flesh, and slips back into some law-system and tries to live by it, he is for the time being not a Christian at all, he

nects
gards
It is
uther
in the
aken
ween
Holy
side.
o be
tions
and
:14-
er 8
able
that
pouline
for
large
ving
ruth
l at
em-
es-
of
atic
nce
ink
only
use
en-
nce.
ng.
he
and
he

has reverted to his former status as a Jew or a pagan; to put it bluntly, it is backsliding and apostasy, to be cured, not by repentance in the ordinary sense but by walking in the Spirit. Thus Rom. 7:14-25 might portray the non-Christian or the professing Christian who is actually trying to live by the Law. Gal. 5:17 surely portrays the latter.

The last word can probably never be said; but Kümmel has gone far toward straightening out the difficulties.

Episcopal Theological School

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

Jesus. By Martin Dibelius. Translated by Charles B. Hedrick and Frederick C. Grant. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949, pp. 160. \$2.50.

The late Professor Hedrick and Dr. Grant have done us a service with this fine translation of Martin Dibelius's last book. When he died, in 1947, Martin Dibelius was one of the foremost biblical scholars of our time, a skilled exegete and a leader in form-critical studies. His work is represented in English by *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, From Tradition to Gospel, Gospel Criticism and Christology*, and *The Message of Jesus Christ*.

The book is a scientific presentation of the career of Jesus insofar as it can be recovered by historical studies. It is a clear and powerful work, partly no doubt because of Dibelius's conviction that an accurate knowledge of the beginnings of Christianity is essential to those who fight now against opponents who more ominously than at any time since the first century assail the very essence of Christianity itself; and also in part to Dibelius's grasp of how faith regards Jesus, how history regards Jesus, and how the two—faith and historical knowledge—are related. It is a resumé of everything Dibelius has written on the Gospels, and is a marvel of condensation—all the issues are touched, and in a little over one hundred pages.

Dibelius opens with chapters on faith and history, the nature of our sources for a knowledge of Jesus, the land and the people of Jesus' day, and the character of the movement that centered about Him. He then treats the message of Jesus as the proclamation of the Kingdom of God and of the pure will of God, the proclamation itself and the deeds of Jesus being "signs" of the presence of the

Kingdom. Though the Kingdom rather than Messiahship is set to the fore, the fact is that Jesus regards himself as the decisive sign. The crucifixion shows that Jesus did regard himself as the one chosen by God to be Messiah and to be installed as Messiah in the Kingdom—which is what one suspects but cannot be sure of on historical grounds from the Confession of Peter, the anointing at Bethany, the Triumphal Entry, etc., for these have been done over from the Christian point of view.

The message of the Kingdom was at once threat, promise, and demand; and the words of Jesus (which are signs of the Kingdom) are to be understood in that light rather than as precepts which disciples are intended to carry out. The teachings have been used (even in the New Testament) for other purposes, but they were intended to state "the one thing necessary," to instill faith in God and readiness for his Kingdom in the face of the two chief enemies of this attitude, care and sin. All of this is summed up in the Lord's Prayer, which shows that the attitude demanded is summed up in the three words *faith, prayer, and love*.

The concluding two chapters are concerned with the Crucifixion and Resurrection, reconstructing the events as far as the sources allow, and delineating the traditions. Here, as at crucial points elsewhere, the variety of traditions is taken by Dibelius as reason for confidence in the historicity of the event; and he regards the resurrection appearances as putting the seal of assurance upon a conviction preconditioned by belief in a general resurrection, by belief in Jesus' Messiahship, and by the Last Supper. And what of the apocalyptic expectations? Dibelius holds that at the end of the historical investigation the decision of faith or unfaith is not whether or not the apocalyptic hopes are adequate, but whether or not one recognizes in the radical nature of the Gospel and of the One who proclaimed it the genuine sign of the actuality of God. Historical study of the Gospels, then, leaves modern man face to face with the events upon the basis of which Jesus' contemporaries made their own decision.

Here then are the "results" of biblical criticism. This is what the Christian historical scholar can do, and what, because Christianity is a historical religion, every serious Christian must do. A better guide than Dibelius would be hard to find. Of course it leaves us dissatisfied from the standpoint of faith, for the historian treats Jesus as "event," and events never affect us as does the person of

the Living Christ. But this task is essential, lest the faith be sundered from its historical roots and evaporate into an inferior grade of philosophy. What Dibelius says of the relation of faith to historical knowledge is a word for the times.

One is not satisfied at all points with the author's conclusions: for example, the teaching of Jesus is too much emptied of its ethical relevance. But one hardly dares raise such a point with reference to the writing of a man who felt in his own being the apocalyptic stress of the war years in Germany. Certainly he left behind him a great book, clear, comprehensive, and compelling.

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

HOLT GRAHAM

Der Brief an die Hebräer übersetzt und erklärt. By Otto Michel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949, pp. x + 374. DM 21 unbound; DM 24 bound.

This is the eighth edition of the famous *Meyer Kommentar*. The first four were prepared by Lünemann, the fifth and sixth by Bernhard Weiss, and this is the second edition to be written by Professor Michel of Tübingen. A glance at his bibliography shows that important publications appearing after 1936—notably the later fasciculi of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch* and E. Käsemann's *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*—made another edition timely.

We have few satisfactory commentaries on Hebrews in English and none that makes full use of the rich material on the history of religions which has become available in the last two decades. The later books of the N. T. cannot be fully understood without reference to Philo, the Mandaean literature, and other gnosticizing works, and this is particularly true of Hebrews. It is probably too much to hope that Michel's work will be translated, but it is at least available to specialists who deal with this important and much-neglected epistle.

Michel's commentary is not only religio-historical and critical-exegetical (like all the Meyer volumes), but also a full and careful theological commentary. The important verses 2:10 and 5:7 are given five and four pages respectively. The former furnishes a good example of the method. Beginning with the remark that 2:10 is a key to the passage 2:5-18, Michel shows that it adopts the doctrine

of the Son of Man and interprets it in the light of the oriental expectation of the Redeemer. As, for example, in the Mandaean writings, the Redeemer (here the "pioneer") blazes the trail which the redeemed follow. "Way, work, and pattern of the Redeemer constitute a unity and bind the Redeemer with the redeemed." Whether the gnostic tradition has fashioned these connections, as Käsemann believes, is uncertain; but it must be conceded that Hebrews presupposes a Hellenistic sacred vocabulary which goes beyond O. T. ideas and concepts. Michel goes on to trace the various connections of the idea of "pioneer of salvation" and his perfection, which he finds not only in Hellenism but in the O. T. words *allûf*, *nâsî*, *sar*, and *rôsh*. He concludes that the language is very old and belongs to an early Palestinian Christology and points to an eschatological valuation of Christ which is at the same time cosmic. "In Hebrews an early Hellenistic Christianity speaks to us, which has taken over Palestinian Semitic materials" (p. 79). It exhibits a firm Christological kerygma; in fact Heb. 1:1-3; 2:11-14; 12:1-3 has analogies to Phil. 2:5-11.

Two other examples of Michel's judgments must suffice. (1) In the introduction (p. 16) he assigns the epistle to an official of early Christianity, of Alexandrian education, theologically independent but drawing on a firm apocalyptic and primitive tradition, in touch with liturgical and credal material and also with Pauline theology, who writes to an Italian church with the purpose of strengthening its faith and endurance in the face of persecution. Against the laxity of the post-apostolic age he fights, using the ideas of early Christian tradition. Despite the fact that the epistle is closely related to I Clement in space and time, there are few traces of early Catholic ideas. (2) A clear distinction is drawn between Philo's allegorical method and that of Hebrews. Philo leads to a timeless philosophy divorced from history; the exegesis of Hebrews leads its hearers toward a new hearing of the Word of God which comes out of history (p. 18). It has been remarked by others that, despite apparent similarities to Platonism, the Epistle to the Hebrews, like the rest of the N. T., finds the ultimate reality manifested not in eternity but in time.

Episcopal Theological School

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

New Testament Manuscript Studies. Edited by Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950, pp. 220 + xxxii plates. \$3.00.

In October, 1948, at the time of the dedication of the Edgar J. Goodspeed Collection of New Testament Manuscripts at Swift Hall in the University of Chicago, a meeting of textual scholars was called. The purpose of this meeting, reflected in the sub-title of this book, "The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus," was to discuss materials available and procedure to be followed in preparing a much needed new apparatus criticus for the Greek New Testament text. Before work could be very far advanced toward the preparation of such an apparatus, it was necessary to determine whether or not there did exist a group of competent and interested scholars. It is a significant fact that this meeting brought together a group of scholars whose ability and interest is such as to warrant great expectations from their future activities along this line. The content of the papers delivered at this conference can be seen from the following notes. The first seven deal with the immediate problems in a traditional order, but the addition of the last two provides a new departure in the field.

I. *The Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament.* Kenneth W. Clark, Duke University.—In addition to a clear statement of the materials available for textual study, Professor Clark expresses a hope that more manuscripts will be found, that detailed work on those now known will be carried forward in the fields of cataloguing, dating, and particularly collation, that a base text for the collator will be settled upon and published and that the relationships between textual criticism and historical theology will be deepened.

II. *The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament.* Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton Theological Seminary.—In his characteristically thorough and well-documented manner, Dr. Metzger covers the development during the last fifty years of the study of the versions as well as the advance of that area in importance. He brings a thorough acquaintance with this area to the task of cataloguing the versions and their present state of availability and utility. The concise presentation of desiderata in every case outlines sharply the task of versional scholars in the near future. One must further commend the 343 footnotes for the 43 pages of text.

III. *The Patristic Evidence for the Text of the New Testament.* Robert P. Casey, Brown University.—Father Casey's discerning mind

is exemplified in his keen differentiation between the use of Patristic evidence for the localized use of a text and for the origin of that text. In relating Patristic evidence to the versions, he says, "It is not the earliest manuscripts and authors which are the most instructive. . . ." His plea for the further study of later manuscripts via the Fathers during periods when those texts were exposed to what he calls "cosmopolitan influences" is most cogent.

IV. *The Citation of Greek Manuscript Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus.* Frederick C. Grant, Union Theological Seminary.—Adequately covering the history of the development of Sigla for designating Greek Manuscripts from Wetstein to Gregory, Dr. Grant is firmly of the opinion that we need no system beyond Gregory's, but that we should develop some method whereby lacunae in Manuscripts cited might be indicated. On the former matter, he says, "Only after all possibly existing manuscripts have been discovered or accounted for can we hope to work out a scheme of absolute classification. Even then, it will have severe limitations. . . ."

V. *The Citation of Versional Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus.* Allen P. Wikgren, University of Chicago.—Admitting the multiplicity of the texts of versions extant, Dr. Wikgren goes to the heart of the problem by attempting to ascertain standards upon which the extent of versional evidence to be cited will be determined. His paper abounds in keen observations regarding detailed difficulties as well as the main problems such as critical editions of the versions and a standard method of citation. In the latter regard he agrees in principle with Dr. Frederick Grant that we do not need a new system so much as a careful revision and expansion of an already existing one, in this case Souter's. This paper makes a fitting companion to that of Dr. Metzger.

VI. *The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus.* Robert M. Grant, University of the South.—Dr. Grant argues for a volume of prolegomena in which the essential problems relative to Patristic evidence could be discussed outside the text; the limitation of citation by the type of text which is being established; and a simplified though general citation of the Fathers by name in the apparatus. Such procedure in this area, would, he states, accomplish completeness and efficiency, not necessarily compatible objectives.

VII. *The Importance of the Michigan Manuscript Collection for New Testament Textual Studies.* Merrill M. Parvis, University of

Chicago.—This essay is an evaluation and historical sketch of a collection well known to the author. As a result of his extensive knowledge of the collection, Dr. Parvis commends its size as being one of the largest in North America, its numerous witnesses to the very early as well as to the comparatively late Greek Text, its Lectionary collection whose value is being appreciated increasingly, and its Coptic materials.

VIII. *Armenian Gospel Illustrations as Seen in Manuscripts in American Collections*. Sirarpie der Nersessian, Dumbarton Oaks. IX. *The Narrative and Liturgical Gospel Illustrations*. Kurt Weitzmann, Princeton University.—These two essays represent the growing appreciation of the place of art history in textual criticism, both in narrative Gospels and in the service books known as Lectionaries. Dr. Sirarpie's paper is interesting not only because it outlines the main avenues of development in Armenian Illustration, but also documents this development at almost every stage with an example taken from the Armenian Gospels now in the United States. Dr. Weitzmann's paper was presented to the conference both as a preface to his forthcoming monograph on the subject, and as representing phases of the subject most interesting to textual scholars. Both authors demonstrate that the discipline of art criticism can be of assistance in dating manuscripts and locating their origin. The set of thirty-two plates used to illustrate these articles makes a fine collection of sacred art through the centuries.

All in all, this is a most profitable volume for anyone at all interested in textual studies of the New Testament. The student as well as the savant will appreciate the treasure-trove of current information in the field so carefully set forth.

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

JULES L. MOREAU

Die Wiederentdeckung von Bethesda: Johannes 5, 2. By Joachim Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949, pp. 28. DM 3.50.

The best-attested reading of John 5:2 is usually understood to mean: "There is in Jerusalem at the Sheep [Gate] a pool which in Aramaic is called Bethesda, which has five porticoes." This takes the word for pool as a nominative. Professor Jeremias argues brilliantly that the word should be taken as a dative, and the verse

translated: "There is in Jerusalem at the Sheep Pool the place which in Aramaic is called Bethesda, which has five porticoes."

The Aramaic *beth hesda* means "house (or place) of mercy," which Jeremias understands as referring to the mercy of God. John 5:2 tells us only that the place was in Jerusalem, and v. 7 that the waters of the pool were occasionally disturbed. The place has been identified with the Siloah pool of 9:7, but the latter bears a different name. Eusebius' *Onomasticon*, written about 324-330 and embodying the oldest local tradition, reads: "Bezetha. A pool in Jerusalem, which is the Sheep Pool and once had five porticoes. It is still shown there as a double pool. Each of the two pools is filled by the yearly rains. One of them has remarkably reddened water, the trace, so they say, of the sacrificial animals which once were killed there. Therefore it is also called Sheep Pool because of the sacrifices." The Bordeaux Pilgrim, a few years later, tells much the same story, and Cyril of Jerusalem, late in the fourth century, explains that there were four porticoes on the four sides of the twin pools and a fifth between them. A church dedicated to St. Mary was later built beside it, and this was succeeded by a twelfth-century structure.

Jeremias and Père L.-H. Vincent, who probably know more about first century Jerusalem than any men in the world, unhesitatingly identify the pool of John 5:2 with the double pool, parts of which were first discovered in 1873 north of the Temple area near the present church of St. Anne. This pool, which is far below the present street level and below the walls of the later churches, was gradually uncovered between 1888 and 1931. It lay along the course of the long since filled-in Bezetha valley and was hewn to a depth of seven or eight meters out of bedrock. Jeremias provides strong evidence for the identification. His monograph is an admirable example of archaeology combined with historical and textual criticism. I saw the pool in 1947 and, although of course I cannot claim to be an archaeologist, I found it an impressive sight and have no reason to doubt that Jeremias' conclusions are correct.

Episcopal Theological School

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

Origen's Concept of Penance. By Ernest F. Latko. Quebec: Laval University, 1949, pp. xxvii + 179.

The author of this dissertation at Laval has, as he says, "at least made an attempt at licking Origen's teachings into shape and perfection." He has done more; he has attempted to give clarity to a very unclear subject, and his treatise is well organized and ably presented. There is, however, a basic difficulty. The author uses the word "penance" for two quite different Greek words, *metanoia* and *aphesis*, and thus introduces considerable confusion into his treatment of the theme. For example, on page 4 he translates the word *metanoia* in Origen's *Commentary on John* x. 17 (p. 188:10 Preuschen) by "do penance", a translation clearly excluded by the context; it means simply "repentance." Thus he should not speak of the distinction between the two words as a "theological distinction" first made by Clement and then set forth by Origen. Moreover, had he used the Berlin edition of Clement (as he did in the cases of Origen and Eusebius) he would have found that the passage where Clement observes that *aphesis* and *metanoia* are different (*Strom.* ii. 55. 6, p. 143:13 Stählin) is based on Hermas, *Mand.* iv. 3. He could not have been so highly impressed by the ingenuity of the Greek fathers who did not encounter a Latin confusion.

Some interesting points which the author makes are these: (1) all capital sins had to have public, not private, penance before absolution; (2) public confession was strongly recommended; (3) no sin is absolutely irremissible, but some sins required more severe punishments than others. In his chapter on the *De oratione* he translates *Orat.* xxviii. 8-10 (pp. 380-81 Koetschau) and admits that it may well be directed against Callistus. But he does not observe that this passage speaks of the remission of sins which the church can give; and his thesis that *aphesis* refers only to remission in baptism or martyrdom thus breaks down, for Origen is not here dealing with those who repent and become Christians, but with sinners within the church.

University of the South

ROBERT M. GRANT

The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion. Second edition. By Martin P. Nilsson. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1950, pp. xxiv + 656.

It is twenty-three years since the first edition of this very important work appeared, a period long enough for Professor Nilsson's views to become known throughout the world and for criticism to do its worst in attacking them. That these views have come to prevail may be inferred from the fact that the article on "Religion, Minoan-Mycenaean" in the new *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1949 (pp. 762f.) is from his pen. There are undoubtedly a few persons who still share the views of F. Max Müller and W. E. Gladstone, but they are a small and dwindling minority. The great advance marked since the heyday of purely "Aryan" views, and even since a date well inside the present century, may be observed by quoting one of the early books of Sir W. R. Halliday, *Greek Divination* (written in 1912):

While a corner of the curtain which veils the prehistoric period of Aegean history has been raised, our knowledge alike of victors and of vanquished in that struggle between an ancient civilization and the invasion of an alien stock is meagre indeed. We are still groping in a Dark Age; and the instruments at our disposal are faulty. We possess a mass of mythology; much of it of late tradition, and some of it to a considerable degree worked over (p. 2).

That the corner of the curtain has been raised still further, and that the tools of research—"the instruments at our disposal"—have been improved, is very largely the work of one man, Professor Nilsson of Lund. The actual excavation in Crete has been the work of Sir Arthur Evans; but the interpretation of the archeological data owes more to Nilsson than to anyone else. Through thick and thin, he has clung to the thesis of the great relevance of Minoan civilization for later Greek religion; and although others share his views, he is still the leader in this theory and interpretation.

The terms used are very important, and must be carefully distinguished. *Minoan* means the pre-Hellenic Cretan culture or religion. The evidence is almost exclusively from Crete (esp. as shown by Sir Arthur Evans's researches). We know practically nothing of the religion or culture of the *pre-Greek* (or even of the earlier Greek) population of the mainland. *Mycenaean* means the culture and religion centered in Mycenae, Tiryns, etc. where the Greeks were in-

fluenced by the Cretans (Minoans), and where nevertheless a pure Greek culture had not yet arisen.

In contrast to Sir Arthur Evans, Professor Nilsson holds that the Minoans were polytheistic, and did not hold the Great Mother to be the one, exclusive, supreme deity. In fact there seems to be evidence for almost as widespread a polytheism in ancient Crete as in later Greece.

The relation of the Mycenaean to the Minoan religion (and culture) is an important and difficult question. Professor Nilsson holds that the common element in the two was the result not of Minoan conquest on the mainland but of contacts by trade or by raid between two more or less independent peoples.

The Mycenaean religion was Minoan only in external veneer. What it essentially was, underneath, we do not know; for, as stated above, there are no records of pre-Mycenaean Greek religion. The epics help us to reconstruct the Mycenaean religion. Zeus is their god from of old—the “invading” Greeks (and/or the pre-Mycenaean Greek population) brought with them their Zeus, “god of the bright blue sky.” How then did he come to be born—and to die—in Crete? The answer is that this is simply syncretism: the Cretan Zeus was originally The Divine Child, born annually (Ch. XVI). The mainland Zeus (with whom the Cretan Divine Child was later identified) was a king, conceived like a Mycenaean one, with a court like Agamemnon’s or Menelaus’s. Athena, on the other hand, is the Minoan palace-goddess, who functions in Homer as the protectress of certain favored heroes. Hera (“Lady”) is another such palace-goddess—though it seems strange to have two with similar functions. (Were the Minoans bigamists? And the Mycenaeans? Homer’s heroes have their *pallakidia*, but each has one wife and one only.)

Other similarities between Homer and the Mycenaean religion are presumably the belief in Destiny (*Moira*) controlling both gods and men. But differences appear too: the Mycenaeans, unlike the Minoans, built magnificent beehive tombs for their dead; in Homer, the dead are *cremated*.—But could the reason for this have been that the heroes were, for the most part, on foreign soil? Did they burn their dead at home in Argos, Thessaly, Attica? There seem to be traces of evidence, here and there in the epics, that the dead were buried, and not always cremated; and even after cremation the bones were buried. Furthermore, a people on the grand trek to new lands

do not leave tombs behind them, or even marked graves: *teste* the pioneers who crossed the plains in '49. If cremation became general for a time (as between the Mycenaean and the later heroic periods) we may be sure there was some good reason for it. That it was an interlude, is obvious from the next important legacy from Mycenaean to later, historical Greek religion, viz. the hero-cult. Mycenaean religion was the medium through which Minoan religion influenced the later religion of the Greeks.

Certain non-Greek myths were derived from Crete, e.g. Zeus's birth and death there (already noted). Hyacinthus was a Minoan vegetation god. The Divine Child abandoned by its mother and reared by others is also Minoan, and so also, perhaps, is the concept of Elysium, the golden isles of the blest. "The two great antitheses in Greek religion are not . . . the Olympian and the Chthonic religion, but the emotional Minoan and the sober Greek religion. [Compare the Canaanite and the Hebrew, in the Old Testament. Also note that Nilsson does not say "Oriental"—he questions the contacts between Minoan culture and the East, even the mainland of Asia Minor.] Historical Greek religion is a fusion of the two, but the contrast lingered on in the archaic age and gave the mystic movements their force." (M.P.N. in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 763. On the final point, archaic mysticism, see the chapter in his *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, I, 1941, pp. 571 ff. On the whole subject, see pp. 237-359, which summarizes his views on Minoan religion, its later survivals, the Mycenaean and the Homeric religion.)

The new edition is superbly printed on beautiful paper, and has over two hundred illustrations, many of them from the first volume of the *Geschichte*.

Union Theological Seminary

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Addressed to Christians: Isolationism vs. World Community. By Floyd H. Ross. New York: Harper, 1949. \$2.00.

Without question the issue upon which Professor Ross has elected to write is one of the most important that confronts Christian thinkers today. Indeed it has always been one of the most important. What is the relation of the Christian Gospel to other ways of salvation? What is the relation of the Christian Church to other religious com-

munities? Anyone who tries to answer these questions stands in danger of being labelled either a narrow isolationist or a shallow latitudinarian. Yet some attempt must be made to give an answer and every honest attempt is to be welcomed.

Dr. Ross writes clearly and with an obvious concern for the emergence of a world community. His book follows an historical pattern and gives a brief survey of the Christian movement from its inception down to the present time. He decides that Jesus was torn between a Jewish particularism and a universal humanism. Paul was a Jew in his thinking about Jesus' relation to God's justice: he was at one with the mystery cults in his emphasis upon the importance of achieving mystical union with Jesus. The Greek fathers were too much concerned with credal definitions: the Latin Church too much with stable institutions. A chapter on "The Hesitant Reformers" is followed by one on "Cautious Advance" and so we are brought down to a final critique of certain expressions of Christianity at the present time.

It is not easy to determine what is Professor Ross's positive position. He is severely critical of any emphasis upon particularism, upon 'chosen-ness,' upon a given revelation, upon elements of uniqueness in Christianity. "The only finality a mature Christian can know is his vocation to be a pilgrim or explorer." "The only finality of any movement or Church lies in its ability to transform all of its historical manifestations into terms of universally available values or meanings." "The Church is to be found wherever there is an ongoing creative development and an inquiring spirit." All that one can say about such statements as these is that they seem far removed from the Christian faith of apostles, evangelists, martyrs, reformers, and missionaries. There are valuable insights in the book and many of the author's criticisms of the Church in its historical development seem to me to be well founded. But the final dictum of Meister Eckhart to which the author appeals—"God is every way, evenly in all ways to him who has the eyes to see. All paths lead to God and he is on them all evenly to him who knows"—seems to be altogether too flimsy a basis on which to build the World Community which Professor Ross so earnestly desires.

Episcopal Theological School

F. W. DILLISTONE

The Man from Nazareth. By Harry Emerson Fosdick. New York: Harper, 1949, pp. 248. \$3.00.

This book is one more contribution to the "search for the real Jesus" which has long been the concern of New Testament study. One generally accepted conclusion resulting from this search is that we are more apt to find the real Jesus as we come to understand better the social, political, religious, racial, and economic backgrounds of which he was a product. This is the approach utilized here.

The device which Dr. Fosdick has used to get fresh insights into the personality of Jesus is to try to see him as he actually appeared to his contemporaries. Inasmuch as the four gospels are in themselves interpretations, the author deems it necessary to get behind their conclusions—if one is to have a chance for an unbiased estimate of the Man of Nazareth. While it may be impossible to project ourselves into the self-consciousness of Jesus and to know what he thought about himself, Dr. Fosdick thinks we can hope to see from the inside what various groups of his contemporaries felt and thought about him, and, in certain cases, through them get a glimpse into his mind and heart.

The groups through whom he attempts to gain this fresh view of Jesus are the crowds of common people, the scribes and Pharisees, the self-complacent, the religious and moral outcasts, the women and children, the Zealots, the Hellenists, and his own disciples.

The value of the book resides largely in the author's ability to reconstruct for the reader the groups about Jesus as they actually were, and not only to make them live for us but to live with a meaning most had not suspected. It is within the framework of this knowledge that we get fresh views of Jesus.

An early chapter dealing with the question of whether Jesus is a myth or not adds very little to the argument, but is an interesting essay in which one has the opportunity to see how the best New Testament scholarship is skillfully handled by one who apparently has read and absorbed most of what has been written of any consequence in this field.

Indeed, a knowledge of the resources of modern scholarship is everywhere evident, and the widest use of the New Testament text, particularly the gospels, adds weight to his arguments. The exegesis and exposition of many difficult passages are quite edifying. This is particularly true in the chapter, "As the Self-Complacent Saw

Him," in which he treats with considerable fulness the radical teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. He is aware of the apocalyptic and eschatological interpretations of these hard sayings, which he rejects. He has little patience with those who would absolutize many of the sayings, such as "Resist not evil." He feels that we have here "ideals which cannot be taken literally but can be taken seriously." From this he goes on to give something positive.

The book is indexed both for subject matter and biblical texts, is well annotated and has an interesting bibliography.

Church Divinity School of the Pacific

HENRY H. SHIRES

Die Stoia. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung. By Max Pohlenz. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2 vols., 1948-1949, pp. 490, 231. DM 40.

Dr. Pohlenz has made Stoicism one of his major interests throughout his life. He was teaching the subject before World War I, for one of his students, a young German officer in France, wrote him to say that he found Epictetus a help in facing danger—and was killed the next day. A book as big as this one is no mere outline of the history of Stoicism, but a thorough study of its inner ethos, its spirit—as the subtitle describes it, the "history of a spiritual movement." The work is big in two senses: it is one of the most important books on Stoicism ever to see the light of day. It is a pity that it has had to be printed (like most books out of Germany these days) on paper that will be rotten and brittle in a few years—though let us hope it will last longer than German books printed between 1915 and 1925, when straw paper was all the printers could obtain.

The religious or theological reader will be interested at once in this book, since its author views Stoicism as centered in the Logos doctrine. This was fundamental for Stoic logic (the Logos is the principle that supports our spiritual-intellectual nature: *unserer geistigen Existenz*); for Stoic physics (the Logos is the principle of order in the universe); for Stoic ethics (the Logos is the guide and the norm in human life). Instead of viewing Stoicism (as some do) as a mere "emphasis" in ethics or ontology, Pohlenz views it as fundamentally a philosophical school, with doctrines, metaphysics, articulated theories and beliefs, and a tradition of the *dogmata* of its earliest teachers. This interpretation is salutary, after the much modern explaining of

Stoicism and of other philosophies as products of the world-situation in the Hellenistic age, where the men of power in the post-Alexandrine era and under the late Roman republic and early empire forced all lovers of freedom to find some inner realm of liberty. We have had altogether too much of this sociologizing of philosophy!

Of Zeno, for example, he says:

Everything intellectual or spiritual (alles Geistige) concentrated itself, for Zeno, in the one concept of the Logos. The Logos formed the specific 'nature' of men as it also did that of the cosmos, of which this is a part. What Zeno felt and understood on this point he found expressed by no philosopher so definitely as by one of the older ones, the then half-forgotten Heraclitus. For Heraclitus the 'obscure', likewise, the Logos was the central concept which revealed to him the meaning of both cosmic and human existence, since it made clear to him that both in the inner life of men and in the vast world outside the same law of reason prevailed, while both pointed back to a common origin. In Heraclitus, moreover, Zeno read nothing whatever about the distinction—to him incomprehensible—between the material and the immaterial. Spirit and matter were still united, and the Logos was bound up with the purest of all matter, fire. (Page 160, from the chapter on "Die Neue Weltanschauung.")

Even this running translation of one paragraph ought to indicate the quality of the book—its broad, comprehensive grasp of the subject, its interesting style. Of the style one may say that Pohlenz writes in the manner of the great masters of German scholarship—as in the grand days before Hitler, or rather before World War I. Let us hope it is an indication that the ample scholarship and the deep culture for which Germany was once famous are still alive, and will prevail once more when the horror and the barrenness of the past two generations is forgotten.

After tracing in detail the history of Stoicism from Zeno to Marcus Aurelius, the author discusses the place of Stoicism in the intellectual and spiritual culture of the Imperial Age (pp. 354-366). Poseidorius and Dio Chrysostom are the best representatives. Perhaps the most interesting (though not the most important) part of the book for the theologian is Part IV, on "The New Spiritual Tendencies and the End of the Stoa." Stoicism had lived on into a new world where its cool Greek rationality was no longer at home, nor appreciated. Hellenistic Judaism (as seen in Philo), Gnosticism, Hermeticism, Or-

phism, Neopythagoreanism and Neoplatonism, Christianity—the world belonged now to new creeds with a transcendent, other-worldly outlook, an ascetic ethics, and a body of revealed doctrines. It was the end, for Stoicism, which could offer men none of these. The concluding chapters of the book, first comparing Stoicism and Christianity and then discussing their mutual relations and finally the influence of one upon the other—this is extremely important (pp. 400-461). Pohlenz recognizes, as Bultmann does, that the Logos of the Fourth Gospel is a *religious* concept rather than a philosophical, and is by no means identical with the Universal Reason of the Stoics (p. 405).

Vol. II contains the notes—a priceless collection of material.

Union Theological Seminary

FREDERICK C. GRANT

The Code of Maimonides. Book Thirteen. *The Book of Civil Laws*. Translated from the Hebrew by Jacob J. Rabinowitz. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949, pp. 345. \$5.00.

The Code of Maimonides. Book Fourteen. *The Book of Judges*. Translated from the Hebrew by A. M. Hershman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949, pp. 335. \$5.00.

These are volumes II and III, respectively, of the Yale Judaica Series, devoted to the authoritative work of Moses Maimonides, in the 12th century, on the Jewish law. Though reviewed together, the volumes are independent. These are the first English translations of these books.

The *Book of Civil Laws* considers religious jurisprudence and the ethical code of law in familiar everyday circumstances. Writing in the days before banks and warehouses and corporations, Maimonides codified Jewish law about business transactions and the misunderstandings which could arise in good faith. Deposits for safekeeping, rents and leases, rental of property, payment of labor, return of loans and borrowed property, trust properties, sale of crops and futures on the basis of the market price, business agreements and other transactions where witnesses should be present, replacement of deeds and contracts which have been lost or faded, are among the topics considered in legal order. Thus the teacher may normally

digress from his special subject; but "on the day of pre-festival assembly, when all come to be instructed in the subjects pertaining to the festival, he is deemed to be lent to his students." That is, the students have a right to expect that just before the final examinations, the professor will keep strictly to the subject.

"Lending money to the poor man is a more meritorious deed than giving charity to him who begs for it" (p. 78). In his work on jurisprudence, Maimonides inserts many bits of human interest and insight. He recognizes that misunderstandings are possible, even in good faith, on the meaning of contracts and documents.

The *Book of Judges* deals with the appointment of courts and judges. This particular book has several references to the conditions necessary for the re-establishment of the Sanhedrin. Therefore this book is now having a renewed and intensive study in the Republic of Israel. The qualifications of judges (and also their disqualification when necessary), the jurisdiction of the courts, the rules of evidence and punishment are all cited. An interpolation provides Treatise 4, "Laws concerning Mourning." Maimonides felt it important to include wise and comforting counsel to those in bereavement. Then he considers the duties of kings and the conditions for maintaining peace and the declarations of war, if necessary.

Some laws are justified as necessary "to check the breakdown of religion." Several notes appear from Maimonides about variant readings of older manuscripts and why one reading is preferred to another. "It is forbidden to lead the community in a domineering and arrogant manner."

Rabinowitz and Hershman both prove able and faithful translators of Maimonides. Difficult technical terms made their tasks much harder. Each man, in his own way, has made his English translation accurate to Maimonides, but with differences of style. While intended for the specialist, these two volumes of religious jurisprudence as codified by Maimonides have, however, considerable human interest to the general religious scholar.

Boston, Massachusetts

DAVID B. ALPERT

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Women in the Old Testament. By Norah Lofts. New York: Macmillan, 1949, pp. xi + 178. \$2.50.

Books are often written in our modern commercial world in order to conform to some publisher's scheme rather than because of any real inner impulse on the part of the writer. This would appear to be such a book. The approach is entirely secular; the treatment of the sources is uncritical and unimaginative. The writing is competent, but hardly brilliant; the psychological interpretations are commonplace. There is little here that will offend anyone, but also very little that is likely to attract. R. C. D.

Theologie und Geschichte des Judentum. By Hans Joachim Schoeps. Tübingen: Mohr, 1949, pp. 526.

A work of first rate importance on one of the most obscure periods of church history. In thorough German style the author deals first with the sources, then with the "Jewish Christian Christology", the Jewish Christians' understanding of the [Jewish] Law, the Ebionitic opposition to the cult, and finally the history of Jewish Christianity and its place in the history of religions. There are valuable appendices on the setting of the Ep. of James, the name "Ebion" in Symmachus, the question of an Ebionite Acts, and so on. The purpose of this brief note is simply to call the attention of students to this valuable work—one of the most important to come out of post-war Germany.

F. C. G.

The Psychiatric Study of Jesus. By Albert Schweitzer. Authorized translation by Charles R. Joy, with a Foreword by Winfred Overholser. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948, pp. 81. \$2.00.

This is the first English translation of a work that appeared in 1913. It is Schweitzer's thesis for the doctor of medicine degree, and deals with some treatises that appeared about that time stating that Jesus was mentally diseased. Dr. Overholser's foreword is an excellent guide to the work, including a sketch of the state of psychopathology at the time the dissertation was written.

H. G.

The Mystery of the Kingdom of God: the Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion. By Albert Schweitzer. Translated with an Introduction by Walter Lowrie. New York: Macmillan, 1950, pp. xv + 174. \$3.00.

This work was first published in 1901 and translated by Walter Lowrie in 1913. The translator's introduction gives a useful account of Schweitzer's work and its reception. Schweitzer's work begins with a survey of the dominant reconstruction of the life of Jesus at the end of the 19th century, according to which the ministry is divided into a period of early success and then one of disillusion and defeat, the Passion narrative is understood in terms of a Pauline theory of the Atonement, the Kingdom understood simply as ethical, and the Passion idea as secret even to the disciples. This view Schweitzer deals with and rejects, and then proceeds to the "consistent eschatology" view for which he is well known from his other works.

H. G.

A Pictorial Gospel: A Life of Christ, in the works of the old masters and in the words of the Gospels. Compiled by Eliot Hodgkin. New York: Macmillan, 1950, pp. 212 + 121 plates. \$3.50.

This book presents a series of fine black and white reproductions of paintings depicting the life of Our Lord, with the relevant passage from the Authorized Version of the Gospels on the opposite page. Some eighteen of the pictures are taken from Bible manuscripts or from old illuminated Bibles and prayer books. As an interesting sidelight, this collection of illustrations, like others that could be made, shows the extent to which those who lived before modern critical study of the Bible felt themselves contemporary to the events—or made the events contemporary to themselves!

H. G.

Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, 1. Teil: Kapitel 1-7. By Wilhelm Michaelis. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948, pp. viii + 384. Sw. fr. 11.50.

Professor Michaelis of Bern is well

known in theological circles as author of a full, careful and conservative introduction to the New Testament, published in 1946. The same learned and reasonable conservatism is characteristic of this popular commentary on the first seven chapters of Matthew. For example, the author deals with all the difficulties that can be raised in connection with the Virgin Birth story and answers them one by one. The most difficult question, as his answer to it indicates, is why other books besides Matthew and Luke are silent on the Virgin Birth. At the end of the discussion, Michaelis adds this observation: "The portrayal [of the birth of Jesus] in 1:18 ff. does not exclude the portrayal of Luke. It cannot be an accident that the two prologues can be

easily interwoven." By contrast, the author finds the problems of the Adoration of the Magi much more troublesome.

The commentary is a model of simplicity and clarity, attractively printed, easy to handle, and it contains almost everything that a preacher or Sunday School teacher could want. Historical and theological questions are discussed fully enough so that the reader can make up his own mind.

At least one of the judgments in the introduction is very debatable. Michaelis holds that the gospel was written in Palestine for Jewish Christians, either in 60-70 or 70-80 A.D. This means that certain obvious Gentile elements are completely ignored.

S. E. J.

Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die Antike Geschichtsschreibung. By Martin Dibelius. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1949, pp. 59.

This is perhaps the last writing of the late Martin Dibelius: though published in 1949 in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences, the paper was presented as long ago as 1944. It is a typically thorough, scholarly, enlightening little work, and has all the lift and enthusiasm of that great scholar's characteristic writing.

The art of the historian, certainly in ancient times, consisted not only in recording facts but also in explaining their meanings. (One might quote what someone said in a recent *Sunday New York Times*, to the effect that chroniclers wrote books of reference, but for the meaning of events one must turn to the sagas!) The ancient historians invented the speeches that adorn their narratives—though sometimes they had authentic data upon which to build. As a rule, the speech was designed to fit not only the occasion but also the general de-

velopment of the book as a whole (this is certainly true of Acts). Sometimes the speech would contain material that really could not have been delivered at that moment—but was nevertheless relevant to the theme as a whole.

The striking relationship between [the speeches in Acts and those found elsewhere in ancient historiography] is manifest above all in this fact: Luke likewise has inserted speeches at the great turning-points in the history of the Christian movement [*Gemeindegeschichte*], speeches that are not always in keeping with the situation presupposed, but nevertheless fulfil a real function in the development of the work as a whole. They help, on their part, to explain the separation of Christianity from Judaism (Stephen), and defend the right of the Gentile mission (Paul's public speech); they show how God himself brought about the mission to the heathen (Cornelius); how the Christian propaganda made use of Greek ideas (Paul before Areopagus); and they point out both the past and the future destiny of the church (Paul to the elders at Miletus). Every one of these speeches stands at a particular turning point, and they prove themselves to be the creation of the author who inserts them into his narrative—sometimes into the very sources which he is using. But in this he was only following the tradition of ancient historiography. (Page 44; cf. 52.)

There is an interesting appendix dealing with Luke's possible use of Josephus, Kratus, and the *Bacchae* of Euripides.

F. C. G.

Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und den übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. By Walter Bauer. Fourth, entirely new edition. Berlin W 35: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1949-50. Lieferungen 1-3, A-enechō, DM 4 each.

This new edition of Bauer's indispensable Lexicon of New Testament Greek

is considerably larger in contents than the preceding edition. The additional material is chiefly to be found in the bibliographies appended to the more important articles. One may gain an impression of the size of the new edition from the fact that although the type page is as large as formerly, the type itself is smaller, and that the first three installments take 480 columns, where the 1937 edition took only 440 columns to deal with the same words. The older edition with its larger type was, of course, somewhat easier to read.

The great value of Bauer's Lexicon is due in part to its inclusion of other early Christian literature, outside the New Testament, and also to the fact that instead of skirting the edges of difficult passages the editor deals with them in detail, often citing the various interpretations that have been advanced. The work is without question the best New Testament Lexicon ever written, and an indispensable reference book for every serious student of the New Testament. It is hoped to complete the work this year.

F. C. G.

Greek Study Aids. Published by Dale P. Crowley. P. O. Box 1, Washington, D. C.

Many students have found cards a useful device in learning languages such as Greek and Hebrew. Many have made these cards for themselves. An enterprising Washington publisher has now made the following available in printed form: (a) *Luo Cards*—a set of 39 cards, each bearing a component part of the particular form of the Greek verb *luo*. (b) *Principal Parts*—67 irregular verbs from *aggellō* to *chairō*. (c) *Greek Vocabulary of the Gospel of John*—540 cards with the Greek word on one side and the English on the other. The use of these cards ought to make

the beginner's study of New Testament Greek much easier, and they are sure to be widely used if teachers know that they are available. The prices are \$.50, \$.50, and \$1.50 respectively. F. C. G.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Bd. V, Lfg. 4, *Homoios-Onoma*. Ed. by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1950. DM 3.90.

The THWB is now once more in its stride, and it is expected that installments will appear regularly every three or four months. The opening article is a continuation of one which began in Lfg. 3, on *homoios*, and contains much insight into Pauline theology from this particular point of view. According to Professor Schneider, Paul had not the faintest inclination in the direction of Gnosticism; in Phil. 2:7, Christ was "der ganz Ebenbild Gottes", not a secondary figure. The great article on *homologeō* and its cognates, by Professor Michel, is important for liturgical study as well as New Testament. There is a wide-ranging investigation of Hellenistic religious parallels and antecedents to both the confession of faith and the confession of sins. Professor Oepke, writing on the word *onar* (18 pages) has produced what is virtually a monograph on the subject of dreams, philosophy of dreams, their interpretation, and the relevant literature in the ancient world. The final article, on *onoma*, by Professor Bietenhardt, is an equally fundamental study of the significance of names in ancient Greek, Hebrew, Jewish, and Hellenistic literature, as well as Biblical.

It ought to be borne in mind that the THWB, although primarily of value in New Testament study, is equally important for Old Testament, classical, philosophical, Judaic, and culture-historical studies. It is a great satisfaction to

know that the work is being continued.

For the benefit of those who do not read German, we may add that an enterprising English publisher is bringing out, in translation, some of the most important articles. F. C. G.

The Apostolic Fathers: An American Translation. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. New York: Harper, 1950, pp. xi + 321. \$3.75.

This volume in a sense completes the task Dr. Goodspeed began with his translation of the New Testament and of the Apocrypha. As in the case of the earlier works, the translation is into modern American English, clear and easy to read. Unfortunately the version is not as accurate as it might be, and the translations already out in the Ancient Christian Writers series (Newman Press) and the Fathers of the Church series (Fathers of the Church, Inc.) seem to this reviewer preferable on that ground. The work includes brief helpful introductory notes for each book in addition to the general introduction. There is also an Appendix on "The Place of the *Didache* in Early Christian Literature", treating the relationship of the *Didache*, the *Doctrina, Barnabas*, and the Coptic *Life of Schnudi*:

The history of the four texts would thus appear to be that a short Greek *Didache* was composed about the year 100 (now lost but represented by translation in the *Doctrina*); that a Greek *Barnabas* was written about A.D. 130, and appears reflected in the Latin version of chapters 1-17; that with the aid of this short form of *Barnabas*, the primitive *Didache* was expanded soon after A.D. 150 into the Greek *Didache* published by Bryennius; and that *Barnabas* itself in turn was later with the aid of the primitive *Didache* expanded into the present Greek *Barnabas*.

H. G.

The Purim Anthology. By Philip Goodman. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949, pp. xxxi + 525; 55 illustrations. \$4.00.

This is a volume of the Holiday Series being published by the Jewish Publication Society (*Sabbath: the Day of Delight*, previously noted in these pages, and *Hanukkah: the Feast of Lights* were the first two), and includes chapters on the history of the feast and of its observance, a wealth of material illustrative of its ancient and modern observance, a collection of stories, plays, pranks, humor, a forty-seven page music supplement, a glossary of terms, and a full bibliography.

H. G.

Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. By Guido Kisch. Notre Dame, Indiana: University Press, 1949, pp. vi + 277.

This is an elaborate study of the manuscript tradition of a Jewish haggadic work of the first century A.D. It illustrates the type of "historical" exegesis which underlies much of Josephus' *Jewish Archaeology* and is occasionally reflected in the New Testament (e.g., I Cor. 10:4; Hebrews 11:37). No certain traces of the work can be found in Christian writings before the ninth century. One reason for this is the fact which the editor points out: "all students agree that its literary style is exceedingly monotonous and full of repetitions." The book retells the biblical history from creation to the death of Saul.

R. M. G.

Zoroastre: Étude critique avec une traduction commentée des Gâthâ. By Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin. Paris: G. P. Maisonneuve, 1948. 198 Boul. St.-Germain. 1948. pp. 301. 11 sh.

At last we seem to be finding firm ground beneath our feet in the study

of Zoroaster—the fact that it has been difficult to do so for many centuries is explained by the author as due to the almost immediate "deformation" of Z.'s teaching (p. 13). An added advantage of this small volume is the accuracy of the translations from the Gathas, of which we are assured by experts who have examined it. The student of Bible or History of Religion may use them with confidence.

F. C. G.

Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels. Ed. by Kurt Galliing. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950, pp. vi + 89 with 4 maps. DM 8.40.

A German "textbook" is a collection of texts; what we call a textbook, the Germans call a *Lehrbuch*. The present volume contains a well-chosen selection of 57 illustrative passages from Bible history—the long story of Sinuhe (1970 B.C.), Tutmoses III's account of his victory at Megiddo (1479 B.C.), the journey of Wen-Amon (1090 B.C.), etc. These passages and many others from old oriental history are given in German translation. The Moabite Stone (ca. 840 B.C.) is given in Hebrew letters, and so also is the Siloam Inscription, some of the Lachish letters (588 B.C.), and one of the Elephantine papyri. There are a number of passages from Greek historians given in the original, and the volume concludes with some Aramaic inscriptions from the Third Century A.D. This is a very useful book for a teacher, and for advanced students in Old Testament.

F. C. G.

Orakel und Mysterien am Ausgang der Antike. By S. Eitrem. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1947, pp. 95. 10 sh.

This fascinating brief study is a harbinger, let us trust, of the major work Dr. Eitrem is now engaged upon, a History of Magic and Divination in

antiquity, to form part (I believe) of the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*. The book is illustrated, and the bust of a Neoplatonist (ca. 400 A.D.) conveys more than pages of print could tell— aspiration, amazement, spiritual sophistication, life-long traffic with the unseen—and much more!

F. C. G.

The Classical Tradition. By Gilbert Highet. Oxford Univ. Press, 1949, pp. xxxviii + 763. \$6.00.

A magnificent survey of Greek and Roman influence upon western literatures—among which the English is the most responsive and the longest-sustained. From the opening chapter, which sketches the decline and fall of the ancient Mediterranean culture, through the successive chapters dealing with the Dark and Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and down to the present day, one is led by the most interested and interesting of guides, who seems to have read all European literature and remembers all that he has read. Anyone who appreciates the classics, anyone who wants to know why current literature and philosophy are so dessicated and uninspiring, anyone who wonders how classical culture and religion (including Christianity) were related—or how fruitful the classical influence was upon the earlier and nascent literatures of modern Europe: let him take up this book. We guarantee he will not put it down until he has finished!

One sometimes wonders what is the future of classical learning, or even of the accurate knowledge of the past, in a world where a great manufacturer pronounces that "history is the bunk" and where "existentialists" propose to "remake the past"! It may be that once more the Catholic Church will have to gather up the fragments that remain, if culture is not to perish utterly—or

rather, a handful of men and women in the Roman, Anglican, and Protestant churches speaking for the West) together with a few liberal Jews and others, who will band together to preserve what survives of the beauty, proportion, substance, wholesomeness of classical thought, literature, and art. The tide of anti-intellectualism that is sweeping the world today, and which has already overwhelmed large areas of Protestantism (including large areas of the Episcopal Church), is just as serious a threat to the survival of our civilization as any that has ever come out of Moscow, or as anything that looked ominous in the fourth or fifth century, before the deluge of barbarism overwhelmed western Europe at the beginning of an earlier Dark Age.

F. C. G.

The American Book of Common Prayer: its origin and development. By John Wallace Suter and George Julius Cleveland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949, pp. vii + 85. Illus. \$1.50.

This little book is written with the laudable purpose of telling the story of the Prayer Book in our Western world from the days of Elizabethan seamen to the revision of 1928. Unfortunately, however, it is not too carefully executed, and the informed and alert reader will detect a number of errors or questionable statements tending somewhat to impair the value of the book despite its attractive format.

To justify the above criticism one example may suffice. On p. 66 it is stated (perhaps without intention) that the commemoration of the departed in the Great Intercession—"We also bless thy holy Name. . ."—was inserted at the last American revision, whereas in fact all but one line of it goes back to the English Book of 1662.

P. V. N.

en in
stant
to
her,
what
sub-
ought,
anti-
world
over-
(in-
scopal
t to
any
, or
the
de-
stern
earlier
G.

yer
John
Julius
Uni-
85.

the
y of
world
n to
how-
ited,
will
ion-
to
its

ex-
ated
the
the
thy
the
fact
the
s.